



April 15, 1980

Seven Years of Individualized Training: An Examination of Specialized Training Grants Funded by the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency, 1973 through 1979

Roger V. Endell

Suggested citation

Endell, Roger V. (1980). *Seven Years of Individualized Training: An Examination of Specialized Training Grants Funded by the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency, 1973 through 1979*. Report prepared for the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency. Anchorage, AK: Justice Center, University of Alaska Anchorage.

Summary

Prior to the establishment of the Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska (renamed the Justice Center in 1979), no program has attempted to train and educate Alaska justice practitioners on a continuing basis and at all agency levels. The Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency, through the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice, has attempted to deal with this training problem on an interim basement through the Specialized Training Grant program, which enables "state and local police officers, correctional officers, prosecutors, public defenders, and court personnel [to obtain] specialized training sponsored by other agencies and institutions," often involving travel out-of-state for programs largely unavailable in Alaska. This study examines individualized grants funded for the years 1973–1979 as a means of measuring the effectiveness of the Specialized Training Grant program as an approach to the continuing professionalization of Alaska's criminal justice personnel.

Additional information

This report incorporates information from a prior report, *An Examination of Specialized Training Grants Funded by the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency 1973 through 1975* by Roger V. Endell (1976).

SEVEN YEARS OF INDIVIDUALIZED TRAINING:

AN EXAMINATION OF
SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
FUNDED BY THE
ALASKA CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY
1973 Through 1979



JUSTICE CENTER

University of Alaska, Anchorage
Anchorage, Alaska

SEVEN YEARS OF INDIVIDUALIZED TRAINING:

AN EXAMINATION OF
SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
FUNDED BY THE
ALASKA CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY
1973 Through 1979

Prepared for the Alaska
Criminal Justice Planning Agency
and the
Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice

JC # 8007

by
Roger Endell
Assistant Professor of Justice
Justice Center
University of Alaska, Anchorage
April 15, 1980

Preface

In August of 1976 the author completed an analysis of the training grants awarded by the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency over the three year period from 1973 through 1975 inclusive. That study was of benefit not only to the CJPA but also to the other agencies of justice within the state, and educational and training providers who would be addressing the continuing professional development needs of justice practitioners statewide for the next several years.

As stated in the Introduction to the original study, Alaska has had to develop rather unique techniques to meet the specific training needs of "the small town police officer, the urban center district attorney, the clerk of the court, the institutional correctional officer and the bush magistrate, to name a few, (who) all share the common need for continuing training and education." While the principal agencies of justice in Alaska are able to meet their mainstream training needs through routine budget and planning cycles, they cannot easily and efficiently provide for individualized training of persons whose professional expertise and/or interests may be highly specialized and yet essential to improving some part of the state's justice services.

The Criminal Justice Planning Agency requested that a second study of the specialized training grants be completed in order to evaluate the four year period which followed the initial report (1976, 77, 78, 79), and to compare and summarize

the results of the total seven years of administration of the specialized training grants program.

In response to that request, this report is organized in three parts. Part I consists of the entire original analysis completed for the three year period 1973 through 1975. Part II is the analysis now completed for the four year period including 1976 through 1979. Part III provides a summary and comparison of the entire seven year period from 1973 through 1979 with a narrative overview of expenditures, participating agencies, types of training programs, comparisons of in-state and out-of-state levels of participation and similar data.

The author wishes to recognize and thank Miss Denise Wike, a student majoring in justice, for her very diligent and conscientious labors which resulted in the compilation of the various tables contained in Part II of this study. She provides an excellent example of the quality and quantity of work that the Alaska justice agencies can expect from future professional employees. Thanks too, must be addressed to Ms. Phyl Booth whose capable and amazing skills permitted the report to be efficiently presented in a readable format. Only the author should be held accountable for any deficiencies which may exist in the content of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
 PART I - SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1973 THROUGH 1975	
Introduction.	1
Purpose of the Study.	3
Data.	4
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1973	6
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1974	10
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1975	14
Three Year Comparison	18
Conclusions and Recommendations	21
Appendix (List of Tables)	28
 PART II - SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1976 THROUGH 1979	
Introduction.	II -1
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1976	II -3
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1977	II -7
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1978	II-11
Specialized Training Grant Utilization - 1979	II-16
Four Year Comparison.	II-19
Appendix (List of Tables)	II-22
 PART III - SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1973 THROUGH 1979	
A Seven Year Overview	III -1
Conclusions and Recommendations	III -6
Appendix (List of Tables)	III-11

PART I

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1973 THROUGH 1975

INTRODUCTION

Alaskans are constantly reminded of the high cost of travel and difficulties in communication related to the State's vast geographic area, its relative remoteness from the contiguous 48 states, and its small disconnected centers of population. Criminal Justice system agencies must consider these problems when establishing policies and procedures for the performance of necessary services to Alaska's citizens.

In order to keep criminal justice practitioners abreast of current developments in legislation, research, standards and methodologies affecting long range planning and day to day operations of the justice system's agencies, it is necessary for system personnel to have access to pre-service and in-service training and education opportunities. The need for a continuing professional development program is essential to the delivery of high quality professional services. The small town police officer, the urban center district attorney, the clerk of the court, the institutional correctional officer and the bush magistrate, to name a few, all share the common need for continuing training and education. No single program yet has met the needs of all of these practitioners statewide. Although the recently established Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska is responding to this problem through the development of academic and continuing professional development curricula and delivery mechanisms, no other program within the State has attempted to train and educate justice prac-

titioners of the several agencies on a continuing basis and at all agency levels.

The Criminal Justice Planning Agency, through the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice, has attempted to deal with this training problem on an interim basis until more suitable resources could be developed. Under the category of "Manpower Development" and within the program "Criminal Justice Training" the CJPA has established each year, for the past several years, a Specialized Training Grant program. This program enables "...state and local police officers, correctional officers, prosecutors, public defenders and court personnel (to obtain) specialized training sponsored by other agencies and institutions..." Many participants must travel outside of the State to attend programs largely unavailable within Alaska. The grant program was apparently developed to insure that participation in the training programs by the State practitioners would be encouraged, and to assist agencies, whose budgets often did not permit expensive yet essential travel to distant training programs, by financing the greater share of costs.

According to the CJPA training fund grant for 1975, "...a balance will be achieved by ear-marking a reasonable ratio of available funds to each of the components of legal, police, and corrections. As a general rule, not more than \$500 will be authorized in travel and per diem per person per training session." These statements roughly outline the framework for the purpose, intent and method of the Specialized Training Grant program.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Because of the rather unique nature of this program, which has impact on the personnel of virtually every agency in the State's criminal justice system, an examination of the records of past participants may be valuable in assessing future training/education interests and may be potentially useful for programming and funding purposes. The intent of this study then, is to examine how the grant money has been utilized, what personnel have received grants, where training has taken place, which training programs have attracted Alaskan practitioners, how many practitioners have been reached via this program, and what was the quality of the program and its relevance to the criminal justice practitioners' work. Additional concerns include whether the specialized training grants are worthwhile in acquiring a fair return in terms of professional development for dollars expended, and whether there are meaningful differences in in-state vs. out-of-state training cost/benefit ratios. An examination of the individualized grants funded for the years 1973, 1974 and 1975 should provide a reasonable profile of the effectiveness of this program as one approach to the continuing professionalization of Alaska's criminal justice personnel.

DATA

Information was sought from the CJPA office's participant files in late May 1976. Data was gathered from copies made of all approval/claim forms and student evaluation of training forms completed by each individual participant taking part in the program in 1973, 1974 and 1975. This mass of material was reduced to tabular form for ease of analysis. The individualized data tables indicate the number of grants per year, the agencies, the topics of the training courses, the training organizations, where and when the training took place, the funding costs for each participant, and a rating of the training programs from excellent to poor based on the participant's evaluation.

The individualized information was then consolidated into total utilization figures for each year under the same categorized headings except that involvement by each agency, participation by topic and sponsoring training organizations were broken out for more meaningful scrutiny.

From the utilization tables a breakdown and comparison of data by system component and a comparison of in-state, out-of-state, and total program participation levels for each of the three years was facilitated.

The tabular data thus provides the opportunity to compare not only levels of individual and financial involvement for each year but also the involvement of the police, legal and correctional components for each year and all three years. A comparison of

in-state and out-of-state programming is also made possible through design of these tables.

Because records were sometimes incomplete, figures for any given year cannot be considered exact, but generally will closely reflect participation levels in manpower and money invested in specialized training for each of the three years. Expenditures reflect per diem and travel costs from federal funds and matching agency contributions, but do not include program enrollment costs which have been borne by the employee's sponsoring criminal justice agency. Neither do the expenditures represent costs associated with individuals' salaries, fringe benefits, time away from the job (which may have required overtime compensation to other employees or temporary loss of services) and similar matters related to the employee participating in a training program.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1973

Table 1 provides identification of each participant utilizing the grant fund for 1973 and program information for which each grant was provided. Of the 67 grants issued for specialized training in 1973, 143 individuals participated at a cost of \$36,764.38. Of these individuals, 107 took part in training programs provided within Alaska at a cost of approximately \$15,000, and 36 practitioners travelled outside the State for programs costing nearly \$22,000. Costs for in-state participants averaged \$140.00 compared to an average of \$606.00 per outside training program participant (see Table 4).

Police, legal and correctional personnel participating in the 1973 grant program totaled 132 of the 143 participants for the year (Table 7). Of these the majority of police (64) and correctional (26) personnel took part in attendance at training programs offered within the state while legal personnel were slightly more evenly divided between in-state (9) and out-of-state (12) attendance. Of special interest from the 1973 figures is the fact that 41% of the expenditures for the year was directed to the 75% of all participants who took part in training within the State. Conversely, it required nearly 60% of the year's training money to send 25% of the participants outside of the State for various programs.

Training topics drawing the greatest interest (Table 4) of criminal justice practitioners in 1973 were concerned with grant

management, law enforcement management and narcotic training. Concurrently, the Civil Service Commission, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Criminal Justice Planning Agency and the Anchorage Community College provided training to the largest groups of people dealing with these topics.

More specifically, four programs offered within the state drew the majority of in-state participants. The Drug Enforcement Administration offered training in which 21 criminal justice system employees participated, the U.S. Civil Service Commission attracted 34 personnel to a program entitled "Network Techniques for Program Management", Anchorage Community College brought 23 employees together for a seminar in "Communication in Law Enforcement Management", and CJPA sponsored a program attracting 20 participants to instruction in grant management. The remaining 9 practitioners attending training in Alaska via CJPA funding were of a singular interest nature. Of the 36 Alaskans attending "outside" programs, 15 were attorneys who attended various legal conferences and seminars dealing with such topics as trial tactics, indigent defense, and juvenile justice. The remainder of "outside" participants attended programs of individual interest ranging from FBI schools and arson and explosives programs to police intelligence and jail operations training.

Table 8 figures indicate that 53% of the 1973 expenditures were utilized by police agency personnel who comprised 56% of the total participants in all training programs. 22% of the year's expenditures were utilized by legal personnel. While corrections

provided 31 of the personnel receiving grants, the percentage of overall expenditures employed by these personnel (12%) was nearly the same as that for "other" agency personnel (13%) who sent only 11 people to various programs.

"Other" agency representatives include personnel from divisions or departments that are not directly involved in criminal justice system functions but may have peripheral interests or responsibilities with justice agencies. Examples within this category included personnel from the University of Alaska, the Division of Personnel, the State E.E.O. Office, the Budget and Management Division, auditors from Legislative Audit, budget and personnel analysts from the Departments of Administration and Personnel, supply and administrative officers from various departments other than criminal justice agencies, and representatives of the Alaska Transportation Commission, Human Rights Commission and the Department of Public Works.

The participatory data is not intended to separate grants awarded to the major agency categories for purposes of drawing conclusions that law enforcement personnel utilized more or less funding than did corrections or legal personnel. Costs of training in the various major component categories vary when consideration is given to the length of various training programs, the distance of the program from the employee's work station, and the comparative needs for training programs among the major components. An examination of funded levels of participation is useful only in establishing a factual picture of where the funds were allocated.

This study does not address the reason for differences that may or may not exist, or what guidelines, if any, may have been used to determine the allocation of the resources. Therefore, the data is helpful in indicating where the funds were expended but not why.

Of the 69 grants funded in 1973, 41 were evaluated as above average or excellent, 14 were rated average and 8 received poor ratings. No evaluations were submitted for four of the training programs. (Note: Several evaluation comments have been selected as examples to indicate the range of ratings from poor to excellent and the reasoning for the evaluation for each of the three one year grant programs. See Table 10.)

The level of involvement for both personnel and funding was greatest in 1973 in that the largest number of criminal justice personnel participated (143), the largest expenditures were made (\$37,000), and the greatest participation in training programs took place within the State (75% of total participation).

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1974

In 1974 the CJPA funded 54 grants which provided individualized training for 61 criminal justice practitioners at a total funded level of \$36,133.75. (Table 2) Almost \$32,000 of the total expended was directed to 46 personnel enrolled in programs outside of the State. Fifteen personnel were enabled to seek training within the State at a funded level of just over \$4,000. The average cost per participant in the State was \$276.00 while out-of-state costs averaged \$696.00 (Table 5). Only two individuals who received grants were from "other" agencies outside of the police, legal or corrections components. The Division of Motor Vehicles sent one of these individuals to an auto theft investigation school and the other, from the Alaska Transportation Commission, attended a program entitled "Administrative Law, Session II" at the National College of the State Judiciary, Reno.

The pattern of geographical participation established in 1973 was reversed in 1974 i.e.: 75% of all criminal justice practitioners attended specialized training programs out-of-state while 25% remained in Alaska for training. This reversal brought costs up while local participation went down. 88% of the expended funds went to out-of-state program participants who comprised 75% of all participants taking part in the program, while 12% of the funds paid for 25% of the participants who attended training in-state. (Table 7).

Criminal identification, legal defense, juvenile justice, and

criminal investigation were the topics drawing the greatest interest of Alaskan practitioners to training programs in 1974. There were no easily identifiable agencies drawing large numbers of personnel to training sessions as in 1973 but several organizations offered courses of a similar nature in a given topic area. The FBI, Alaska Peace Officers Association, Drug Enforcement Administration, Office of Child Advocacy, Practising Law Institute, Trial Lawyers of America, National Legal Defenders Association and the International Bomb Technician Association were typical training providers who attracted three or more Alaskans to their programs. Twenty-five additional training organizations each provided programs for one or two Alaskan personnel (Table 5).

Of the preceding identified training sponsors, the Drug Enforcement Administration provided training to two Alaskans, the Office of Child Advocacy attracted four personnel to a seminar on "The Child and the Law", the FBI (in conjunction with the Public Safety Academy) trained three practitioners at a seminar for instructors, a criminal intelligence seminar sponsored by the Alaska Peace Officers Association attracted four personnel, and the Alaska Association of Realtors attracted two Trooper personnel to a program in real estate fraud. These five entities drew all of the 15 justice personnel who participated in training programs via CJPA grants within the State in 1974. Although there was one more training "provider" within the State in 1974 than in 1973, there was significantly less participation. In 1973 in-state programs attracted 107 practitioners while 1974 programs attracted only 15

under the specialized training grant program.

The police agencies maintained approximately the same level of involvement and funding in 1974 as they had in 1973 (Table 8). 55% of the year's expenditures paid for the 56% of all participants, who were from police agencies, to attend training programs. Legal practitioners utilized 24% of the funds, corrections used 17%, and other agency personnel required 4% of the total expenditures. Again, the data indicates the utilization of funds among the agency categories but cannot be used to explain the rationale for the differences. Therefore, no conclusions should be drawn on the value of grant disbursement differentials.

Although correctional personnel utilized 17% of the funds for the year, only 13% of the participants attending specialized training programs were from corrections. For comparison, 1973 saw correctional personnel employ 12% of the funds for the year and this resulted in their representing 31% of all participants in specialized training. This difference is explained by examining Table 7. Twenty-six correctional personnel participated in training programs within Alaska in 1973 at an average cost of only \$99 per person while the five who went out of state that year were funded at an average of \$401.00. In 1974 no correctional personnel took part in training in-state, but eight traveled outside of Alaska at an average cost of \$774 per participant. It is obvious that fewer personnel can participate and do so at a much higher cost in out-of-state programs than would be the case if training were available within the State.

Forty of the 61 criminal justice practitioners evaluated their training involvement at above average to excellent in quality. Average ratings were given to ten programs; 3 rated poor evaluation and 8 programs received no evaluation. (See Table 10 for sample comments).

Total grants dropped from 67 in 1973 to 54 in 1974, participation dropped from 143 to 61, but expenditures dropped only slightly from \$37,000 to \$36,000. A major change took place from the previous year in that 88% of the funds for 1974 were utilized to fund 75% of all participants to outside of the state programs, a reverse of the previous year funding pattern.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1975

Table 3 lists the 43 participants receiving specialized training grants for the 1975 program. The 40 grants, which required funding at \$27,774.31, represent a much lower level of funding and personnel participation than the previous two years of the study. The most dramatic difference, however, in 1975 participation data, occurs in in-state vs. out-of-state funding and levels of involvement. Only one criminal justice practitioner was funded to attend a program provided within the State. This single program was funded at \$347, which permitted the Hoonah Chief of Police to attend a Crisis Intervention Workshop, sponsored by the Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska. On the other side, 42 participants were funded at a total cost of \$27,426.91 (or 99% of the total expenditures) to attend programs out-of-state. The average cost for these participants was \$653 or almost double the cost per participant of the in-state trainee (Table 6).

The average cost per participant varied only slightly between trainees sent out-of-state from police agencies (\$608) and the Division of Corrections (\$619) but differed greatly from the average cost of legal practitioner training(\$846). These costs reflect actual average expenditures in 1974 for police, corrections and legal agencies. The comparison is useful in comparing the costs of enabling representative practitioners to take part in individualized programs. It should be remembered, however, that some types of training may be inherently more expensive per unit than are

others. Time, distance and comparative agency needs for training must also be considered.

It should be noted here that the average cost figure for all agencies sending personnel to out-of-state training programs for each of the 3 years was much higher than the costs for in-state training. Conversely, and more importantly, the average cost figures for in-state participation is significantly lower than for out-of-state training programs.

The topic of greatest interest for training in 1975 was in the area of civil rights, ie, EEO compliance. Juvenile justice, legal defense, and motor vehicle programs drew small groups of interested Alaskan practitioners. However, as in 1974, no single training program attracted relatively large numbers of practitioners as was the case in 1973. LEAA, in joint sponsorship with the International Association of Human Rights Agencies, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators and the National Council of Juvenile Judges attracted 13 of the 43 participants. The remaining 30 practitioners attended a variety of training programs singly or in pairs to learn more of subjects ranging from privacy and arson to consumer protection and explosives (Table 6).

The level of funding and level of personnel involved in training programs from police agencies dropped slightly from the previous year's 47% of the total expenditures. Legal practitioners' funding involved increases from 22% of the total spent for specialized training in 1973, and 24% of the 1974 expenditures to 27% of the 1975 money. Correctional personnel were funded at approximately

the same level as the previous year at 16% of the total expenditures (Table 3).

The evaluation of training programs attended by criminal justice practitioners during the 1975 grant year were incomplete in that 24 participants submitted no evaluation comments. Of those that were available, 5 programs were rated as excellent, 8 above average and 6 programs received average ratings. (Sample comments Table 10).

As stated previously, the 1975 grant year was significantly different in level of funding, level of participation by practitioners, and in training funded for in-state programs. Funding was eight to nine thousand dollars less than in 1973 and 1974. There were 100 fewer participants in 1975 than in 1973 and 18 less than in 1974. Only one individual received funding for an in-state training program in 1975 compared to 25% (15) of the participants in 1974 and 75% (107) of the 1973 participants.

Of course, one important consideration for the decrease in expenditures and numbers of justice practitioners utilizing specialized training grant funds in 1975 may be related to increased program opportunities and agency funding capabilities which provided training without the need for previous levels of CJPA funding. The Public Safety Academy certainly had expanded its programming during this period. Also, with the Criminal Justice Center at the University of Alaska coming into existence, additional programs were made available. The Center provided training in such topics as Law and Psychiatry for lawyers and doctors, Homicide Investigation for

police, district attorneys and medical personnel, Crisis Intervention for police, probation and social service personnel, Sentencing Alternatives for all criminal justice practitioners and the general public, and Law and the Judicial System for social workers. As these program offerings are increased with possibly different methods of funding, it may be that CJA specialized training grants will address a much more specialized and specific type of training at even lower funding levels.

THREE YEAR COMPARISON

Over the three year period of the study a total of \$100,672.44 was expended on specialized training for individuals and small groups of Alaskan criminal justice practitioners. The comparative figures (Table 9) indicate that costs for total program participation escalated from a low average of \$257 per individual in 1973, to \$592 in 1974 and finally to \$646 in 1975. At the same time the numbers of those able to successfully obtain a share of the training funds declined from a high of 143 individuals in 1973 to 43 in 1975. The table indicates that overall participation in out-of-state and within-state training programs totaled almost the same number of personnel i.e., 123 in-state, 124 out-of-state, for the 3 year period. However, as pointed out earlier, the in-state training participation was greatest in 1973 (107 individuals) and declined dramatically to one individual in 1975. While the average costs of "outside" training were consistently higher, the in-state specialized training costs based on the use of these grants was consistently and significantly lower.

One may conclude from these comparative figures that out-of-state training costs totaled 4 times the amount required to train the same number of practitioners within-the-state. Of course, numbers of personnel and the amount of money required to permit individualized training to occur are not the only factors to be considered in making these comparisons.

A substantial justification for out-of-state participation in individualized training can be made, as noted by the Criminal Justice Planning Agency in its grant requests, by pointing to the fact that many of these programs have been unavailable within the State and yet are worthwhile (some are essential) to continuing professional development of criminal justice practitioners. Examples of such outside programs include the national level district attorney and public defender conferences, the annual meetings of the American Correctional Congress, the national conferences on juvenile justice, and a few specialized law enforcement programs available only at regional schools.

An average of \$33,447.48 was expended each year for training an average of 82 participants. The average cost for each participant over the 3 year period was \$403 per person per training session. However, these averages are useful only in terms of their potential use for planning for a future period on an overall system basis. They are not helpful in planning fund allocations toward a given agency or training effort.

Certain difficulties are inherent in the subjective classification of the evaluation remarks of the participants. The non-receipt, or non-availability, of 24 of 43 program participant evaluations for 1975, by example, reduces even a relatively subjective effort to questionable usefulness. It is not possible to compare the evaluation of in-state vs. out-of-state programs in any meaningful or dependable manner. A much more extensive and systematic effort should be made to establish a reliably sound and valid

evaluation format that would enable useful comparisons to be made. It may be quite helpful to know whether programs presented in-state were seen as more valuable than those "outside" and why, what subject matter was the most beneficial in terms of the relationship to actual job performance, and whether individual programs would be worthy of continued participation from Alaskan practitioners on a larger scale.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It would seem that if effective utilization of the specialized training grant program is to continue, certain essential decisions must be made. These decisions must relate to overall training issues identified by the examination of the data from this study. If a basic commitment to encouraging criminal justice agencies to follow a specific and well planned outline of personnel development is not required then the grant funds may become a "give-away" program which attempts to accomplish little.

Based on the comments and evaluative remarks submitted by the recipients of the grant money over the three year period, there is no question that the program is worthwhile and should continue. The participants' evaluations generally indicate that involvement in this program provides a valuable resource in the professional associations that are facilitated through interaction with other justice practitioners statewide and/or nationwide. This is repeatedly commented upon as being a positive benefit in addition to the specific purpose of the training for which the grant was intended. However, it may be argued that professional contacts can be facilitated independently from training programs and at lesser costs. Further, there may be distinct advantages in drawing nationally known and respected leaders in the criminal justice field to Alaska, to share knowledge with a much wider localized practitioner audience.

To be of the greatest benefit, training should relate to agency manpower development needs, hence agency needs assessment is critical to the design and/or selection and delivery of training programs. The Criminal Justice Center is attempting to gather information which will identify academic and continuing professional development needs of the several agencies statewide. A manpower research project being conducted by Dr. John Angell, Director of the academic component of the Center, indicates that of all criminal justice employees statewide (including professional, support and clerical) approximately 48% are involved in police agencies, 30% are law related personnel, and 23% are employed in the correctional field (Table 11).

Specialized training grants have been utilized on a slightly different percentage basis than is apparent from the distribution of criminal justice employees. Police personnel, who comprise 48% of all criminal justice system employees, have consumed an average of 55% of the funds facilitated by the training grant program over the 3 year period studied. Law related personnel, 30% of all systems employees, utilized 19% of specialized training funds and corrections, 22% of all system personnel, employed 19% of total funds.

Clearly, as these figures indicate, total expenditures have not been proportionate to the numbers of employees in the three major components of the criminal justice system. If an objective, as stated in the CJPA training fund grant for 1975 is that "...a balance will be achieved by ear-marking a reasonable ratio of available funds to each of the components of legal, police, and

corrections..." then this objective has not facilitated equal total expenditures. It may be questioned whether, in fact, it is important that equitable distribution of funds be mandated. Numbers of personnel within a component would not necessarily translate to the need for training. It is in examining the level of competency, past experience, professional preparation, and personnel performance standards that training needs can more easily and more meaningfully be defined. Need assessment would therefore appear to be more critical than the identification of the numbers of employees. Nevertheless, totally disproportionate funding among the components might require extensive justification. To be most effective the funds should reach those personnel with the greatest needs, therefore criteria, including the purpose of a training grant request in relationship to the employees' job function, would appear to be appropriate.

The greater percentages of employees, (69% of police employees and 78% of correctional staff, Table 11) are classified as professional practitioners while 55% of law related employees are clerical staff. Implications for training are thus clarified somewhat in that the effort should be continued to provide training for professional police and correction staff but clerical staff development must be provided to substantial numbers of legal agency employees.

In another related research project being conducted by Peter Ring, Director of Research at the Center, preliminary data gathered from a statewide survey of criminal justice agencies identifies priorities for continuing professional development subjects as indi-

cated by the various agencies. By far the chief priority for continuing professional development requested by the agencies was for training in the area of management and supervision. Investigation, community relations and criminal and substantive law were listed as second level priority topics of equal importance. The next priority level receiving equal requests were for training in English communication, criminal procedure, crime and alcohol, juvenile procedures, Native Alaska and narcotic and dangerous drugs topics. Courtroom procedures, family disturbances, correctional practices and the judicial system were topics receiving the fourth level of priority requests. Many additional topics were identified as singular requests for training. It is possible that the personal biases of the questionnaire respondents are reflected in these priorities. However, a sufficient cross-sampling of agencies reflected similar responses so that individual biases, if evident, at least reflect similarities of opinion.

The identification of training priorities requested by the agencies is of great importance to this study in that legitimate comparisons can be made between training priorities requested and training received by practitioners through the specialized training grants over the past three years (see Table 12). It is apparent that although management and supervisory training has been identified as the top priority for training, only in 1973 did significant numbers of criminal justice personnel take part in such training via the grant program. Programs in civil rights, criminal identification, trainer instruction, arson, explosives, motor vehicle, consumer

protection and security and privacy training were participated in throughout the three year period by practitioners yet none of these topics were identified in the four levels of priorities identified as topics requested. It could be argued that since training had been received in these topics that they are no longer considered priorities. There is the possibility, however, that participation in these programs was more a matter of opportunity than need. No conclusions are possible from this data.

Also worthy of note is that of the four levels of priorities identified as topics requested for training through the survey, several topics were not pursued in actual training received by grant participants. These topics included community relations, English communications, crime and alcohol, Native Alaska, courtroom procedures, family disturbances and an understanding of the judicial system.

Although these topical comparisons cannot be precise at this point it is nevertheless beneficial to examine general areas of topical training interests and levels of involvement in actual training received.

There would appear to be great advantages in developing training programs within the State that could be accessible to a much wider practitioner audience at a much lower cost than is possible by funding personnel to participate in programs offered elsewhere. Of course, there will always be the need to send selected personnel to selected programs of national scope outside of the State. National level conferences are unlikely to be offered in Alaska and it may

be essential that agency representatives attend these sessions. However, a strong effort should be made to bring training programs to the practitioner. Localized programs can provide the opportunity for a greater number of personnel to participate, it can localize problems and procedures and it can facilitate communications among Alaskan criminal justice system practitioners. The costs of such efforts would appear to be justified if manpower resources and continuing professional development are essential to providing high quality professional services to the citizens of Alaska.

In a review of the course titles of programs in which Alaskan personnel participated outside, it is apparent that many of the programs offered over the three year period could be presented within the State. Whether these topics might require "custom design" or whether training "packages" already in existence elsewhere might be brought to the practitioner is not a major issue. The important concern is that programs are offered on an ever-expanding basis to increasing numbers of criminal justice practitioners within the State and directed toward all practitioner levels from line staff to executive management. Priorities and guidelines should be developed to insure the "best" use of funds. An evaluation system designed to ascertain the impact of individual programs and their value toward improving the justice system in Alaska is essential.

On an individual basis, program participation might be facilitated for each employee when an accurate profile of his experience, education, training and job function is delineated. Questions

worthy of concern to an applicant for training funds might be concerned with how the training will relate to the job function, to the continuing professional development of the employee, the value of the training to the employee's agency, and finally its value to the public being served by the employee.

It would seem then that the Criminal Justice Planning agency has provided a valuable program where little other resources had existed. It will probably be necessary to continue the specialized training grant program until and unless the individual agencies and training facilities are able to develop sufficient resources of their own. CJPA is in an excellent position through its planning process to encourage the development of strong training programs within the State and to encourage practitioners to participate fully in them as they are developed. This should be done based on the assessed and expressed training needs of agency personnel as justified by the agency in an over-all continuing professional development plan. At the present time, the Criminal Justice Center, the Police Standards Council and the Alaska Public Safety Academy should work cooperatively with CJPA in the development of programs. The criminal justice system must be flexible and responsive in order to insure that duplication is eliminated and that a continuum of professional development training and academic programs are available to all criminal justice system practitioners across the State. Alaska can afford the best in criminal justice professional services and should actively pursue this goal through continuing professional development opportunities provided to all justice personnel.

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLES</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
1	1973 Individualized Data.	29
2	1974 Individualized Data.	32
3	1975 Individualized Data.	34
4	Utilization for 1973.	36
5	Utilization for 1974.	37
6	Utilization for 1975.	38
7	Comparison by System Component, 1973-1975. .	39
8	Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency, 1973-1975.	40
9	Three Year Comparison.	41
10	Comments, 1973-1975.	42
11	Manpower/Funding Comparisons, 1973-1975. . .	43
12	Comparison of Training Request Priorities with Training Participation.	44

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

Table 1

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
1973
INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Good	Average	Below Average	Poor	Comments
Chief	Kodk PD	Retraining Session	FBI Natl Acad Assoc	Billings, MT	7/15-18/73							(did not attend)
Recs & ID Supvr	Pub Saf	Ann Intl Assoc ID Conference	Intl Ident Assoc	Jackson, WY	7/29-8/2, 73	854.00					x	
Asst A G	Dept Law	Annual Meeting	Natl Assoc A G's	St Louis, MO	6/10-13/73							(did not attend)
Lieutenant	Fbks PD	In-Service Training Session	FBI Natl Acad Assoc	Billings, MT	7/15-18/73	491.56					x	
Chief	Sitka PD	"	"	"	"	308.00					x	
Exec Director	Parole Bd	103rd Annual Congress	Amer Correct Assoc	Seattle, WA	8/12-17/73							
Chairman	"	"	"	"	"	661.22				x		
Ad Jst Bndgt Anlst	Budg & Mngt	Seminar Eval St Crim Just Prog	Council of St Govmnts	Indnapol, IN	8/26-30/73	733.46				x		#1
Distr Attny	Dept Law	Natl District Attny Confer	"	Aspen, CO	8/5-12/73	761.65	x					
Attorney	Pub Def	Pub Defender Conference	Natl Coll Cr Def Lwyr & Pub Defenders	Houston, TX	7/29-8/19, 73							(pd for by trng agency)
"	"	"	"	"	"							
Patrolman	Kodk PD	Law Enforc Drug Trng School	Drug Enforc Admin	Anchor, AK	7/23-8/3, 73	77.27	x					
Chief	N Pole PD	"	"	"	"	87.27	x					
Lieutenant	Sword PD	"	"	"	"	35.00	x					
Captain	Pttrsbg PD	"	"	"	"	190.54						
Lieutenant	Crdoval PD	"	"	"	"	40.00						
Investigator	CIB/AST	Death Investigation Seminar	?	Kan Cty, MO	9/18-24/73	710.00						x
Data Clerk	Correct	Basic Skills in Statistics	Civil Service Comm	Prtlnd, OR	10/29-11/2, 73	500.0			x			
"	Pub Def	Juvenile Justice Conference	"	San Fran, CA	10/7-11/73	225.00						
Hwy Reloc Ofcr	Dept Law	Federal Relocation Seminar	LEAA	San Fran, CA	9/30-10/3, 73	372.00	x					
"	Dep HGSS	Pacif NW Conf on Viol & Cr Jst	Battelle Law & Just Ctr	Isquah, WA	12/6-8/73	242.04						
Mngt & Supervisory	20 Correc	Network Techques for Proj	US Civil Service Comm	Anch, AK	12/10-13/73						x	#2
Personnel	9 Police	Management	"	"	"							
"	1 Crt 2 Legal	"	"	"	"							
"	1 Cty Mngr	"	"	"	"	4011.27						
Attorney	Pub Def	CE3 Advanced Crim Law Semin	"	Brkly, CA	8/27-31/73	480.00						
Attorney	Pub Def	Juvenile Justice Conference	Natl DA Ass & Natl Council, Juv Judges	San Fran, CA	10/7-11/73	590.00						x #3
"	Anch PD	3rd Ann Drug Trng Conference	Drug Enforc Adminis	Memphis, TN	11/13-15/73	591.00						
Captain	Anch PD	Westrn States Burg Invest Sem	"	Lk Tahoe, NV	10/2-6/73				x			
Investigator	"	"	"	"	"	976.74						
"	Anch PD	Civil Rights Compliance Trng	LEAA	Sn Diego, CA	12/9-14/73	510.00					x	
"	Fbks PD	"	"	"	"							(pd by local funds, no eval)
Attorney	Dep Law	Network Techques for Proj Mngt	US Civil Service Comm	Anch, AK	12/10-13/73	269.27					x	

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS

1973

INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Excellent
Above Avg.
Average
Poor
Comment
Code

1973 - continued
Page 2

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Above Avg.	Average	Poor	Comment Code
Administrator	Par Admin	O Basic Skills in Statistics	Civil Service Commiss	Seattle,WA	1/21-25/74	529.54				x	
Detective	Ktn PD	1st Natl Conf on Juven Justice	Natl Counc Juv Cr't Jdgs & Natl DA's Assoc	Nw Orlns,LA	1/27-31/74	545.00	x				
Cross Section	10 AST, 12	Comm'n in Law Enforcement									
	Pol, 1 DOC	Management	Anch Comm'n College	Anchor,AK	1/21-23/74	1210.00		x			
Attorney	Dep Law	Trial Tactics Seminar	Natl Conf of DA's	Sn Diego,CA	2/3-7/74		x				#4
"	"	"	"	"	"	1125.39					
Attorney	Dep Law	1st Natl Conf, Mgmt of DA Ofc	Natl Coll DA's, Natl Ctr Wash,DC		2/8-18/74					x	
"	"	"	for Prosec Mngt, and	"	"					x	
"	"	"	Natl DA's Assoc	"	"	2202.00				x	
Attorney	Pub Def	Legal Rights Mentally Handicpd	Practising Law Instit	San Fran,CA	1/31-2/2,74						(did not attend)
Attorney	Pub Def	1st Natl Conf Juvenile Justice	Ntl Counc Juv Jdgs, Natl D A Assoc	Nw Orlns,LA	1/27-31/74	556.00			x		#5
Investigator	AST	Blood Stain Identif Seminar	Biscayne College	Miami, FL	2/24-3/1,74	1015.90		x			
Detective	Fbks PD	Theft Seminar	AST	Anchor,AK	2/20/74	126.00		x			
Patrolman	"	"	"	"	"	121.00		x			
Sergeant	Ktn PD	NW Fire & Arson Seminar		Eugene,OR	4/29-5/3,74	229.83		x			
Patrolman	Fbks PD	2nd Ann Explos Ord Disp Conf		Sacramto,CA	3/16-23/74	493.00	x				
Chief	Jun PD	Police/Prosecution			4/19-27/74	724.95	x				
Pol Admin Coord	Anch C C	Polygraph School	Keeler Polygraph Inst	Chicago,IL	6/1-7/12,74	2470.00	x				
Chief	Nome PD	Instructor Training	FBI		4/15-5/2,74	1356.00			x		
Sergeant	AST	Patrol Management Seminar	IACP	Seattle,WA	3/31-4/1,74				x		
Corporal	"	"	"	"	"	562.00			x		
Patrolman	Anch PD	Crime Prevention Theory & Prac	Natl Crime Preven Inst	Lousville,KY	5/13-6/7,74						(did not attend)
Superintendent	Correct	Jail Operations Trng Methods	WA State Crim Just Ed & Training Center	Isaquah,WA	4/1-5/74	314.85				x	
Personnel Analyst	Div Person	Compliance Feder. Guides,		Anchor,AK	5/20-24/74			x			
"	"	Employ Test & Selection		"	"	706.37		x			
EEO Officer	Dep Law	EEO Workshop II	Civil Serv Commiss	Anchor,AK	5/20-22/74	235.00				x	
Mngmt & Adminis	2-AST	CJPA Training	CJPA	Juncau,AK	4/19/74		x				#6
Personnel	7-PD's			Frbnks,AK	4/11/74						
	5-Correct			Anchor,AK	4/12/74	410.17					
	2-Cty Admin										
	2-Pub Def										
	2-Courts										
Police Officer	Kenai PD	Drug Enforcement Seminar	Drug Enforc Adminis	Frbnks,AK	6/3-5/74	203.00	x				
Patrolman	Anch PD	"	"	"	"	160.00	x				

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
1973
INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

1973 - continued
Page 3

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Comments
Investigator	AST	Intelligence Analysts School	CA Dept of Justice	Santa Barb, CA	6/3-14/74	522.00		x			
Chief	Wrang PD	Drug Enforcement Seminar	Drug Enforce Admin	Franks, AK	6/3-5/74	352.00			x		
Investigator	Jun PD	"	"	"	"	282.00			x		
Police Officer	Homer PD	"	"	"	"	240.00	x				
Attorney	Cty BarJun	Short course for Pros Attorneys	Southwestern Law Inst	Dallas, TX	6/10-13/74	754.46	x				
Detective	Ktn PD	Drug Enforcement Seminar	Drug Enforce Admin	Franks, AK	6/3-5/74	450.00		x			
Par Admin Ofcr	Par Ofc	Effective Letter Writ for Mngt	Civil Serv Comm	Prtlnd, OR	6/3-4/74						(not approved)
Sergeant	Kodk PD	Drug Enforcement Seminar	Drug Enforce Admin	Franks, AK	6/3-5/74						(unable to attend)
Sergeant	Ktn PD	"	"	Anchor, AK	7/23-8/1, 74		x				
Detective	"	"	"	"	"	920.00		x			
Budget Analyst	Dep Admin	OMB A-102 Attach "O" Procurement	LEAA/CJPA	Anchor, AK	8/27-28/74	185.27	x				
Supply Officer	Dep H & SS	"	"	"	"	185.27					
Admin Officer	Pub Safety	"	"	"	"	212.79			x		
Auditor	Legis Aud	"	"	"	"	190.27	x				
Admin Officer	Franks PD	FBI Instruct Develop Trng Crs	FBI/AST Academy	Sitka, AK	7/8-12/74	?		x			
Chief	Moore PD	Chief's Meeting	AK Chief Association	Juneau, AK	10/31-11/2, 74	110.0		x			#7
Policeman	Kenai PD	St & Local Law Enforce Trng	Drug Enforce Admin	Anch, AK	4/29-5/9, 75	508.00		x			
Sergeant	Ktn PD	"	"	"	"	689.00		x			
Policeman	Kenai PD	"	"	"	"	600.00		x			
"	Bethel PD	"	"	"	"	624.60	x				
"	Seldna PD	"	"	"	"	388.00	x				
"	Juneau PD	"	"	"	"	621.00		x			
"	Wrangll PD	"	"	"	"						(did not attend)
"	Seward PD	"	"	"	"	480.00	x				

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
1974
INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Table 2

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Poor	Comment
Prob Ofcr	Correct	19th Ann Juv Ofcrs Institute		U Minn,Mine	6/17-8/2/74	(canceled, not funded)					
Patrolman	"	Drug Enforcement Seminar	Drug Enforce Admin	Frbrks,AK	6/3-5/74	385.54		x			
Chief Police	Sewrd PD	Law Enforcement Leadrshp Sem	Intl City Mngrs Assoc	Seattle,WA	8/74	347.07			x		
"	Haines PD	Drug Enforcement Seminar	Drug Enforce Admin	Frbrks,AK	6/3-5/74	335.00		x			#1
Investigator	CIB/AK St Tprsr	Homicide Seminar	FBI	Mrysvil,CA	7/15-30/74			x			
Investigator	"	"	"	"	"	1566.60		x			
Asst AG	Dept Law	Natl Conf Consum Ofc Admins	White House Consum Aff	Wash,DC	6/14-21/74		x				
"	"	"	"	"	"	1039.14	x				
Director	Correct	The Child & the Law	Offic of Child Advocacy	Anch,AK	6/16-19/74						
"	"	Conf on Crime & Delinquency	Natl Counc Crime & Del	Boston,MA	6/22-27/74	699.51				x	
Trng Officer	Anch PD	FBI/AST Instructors' School	FBI/AST	Sitka,AK	7/8-12/74	307.67		x			
Recrds & ID Supvr	Pub Saf	Identification Educ. Conf.	Intl Assoc for Identif	Wash,DC	7/28-8/2/74	748.05		x			
Director	Pub Def	Public Defender Workshop	Practicing Law Instit	New Yk,NY	6/20-22/74	500.00		x			#2
Sr Staff Attrny	Pub Def	Short Course for Def Attrnys	N.W. Univ Schl of Law	Chicago,IL	7/8-12/74	630.00		x			
Chief	Sitka PD	Natl In-Service Academy	FBI	Anch,AK	7/15-17/74	259.00	x				
Super Crt Judge	Crt Sys,Jn	The Child and the Law	Ofc of Child Advocacy	Anch,AK	6/17-18/74						
Juven Ofcr	Cty Ketch	"	"	"	"						
Magistrate	Crt Sys,Bw	"	"	"	"	784.21					
Sergcant	Jun PD	Trainers Seminar	FBI/AST	Sitka,AK	7/8-12/74	166.00	x				
Public Defender	Pub Def	Natl College of Advocacy	Assoc Trl Lwys Amer	Cmbrge,MA	7/21-28/74		x				
"	"	"	"	"	"		x				
"	"	"	"	"	"	1500.00	x				
Director	Correct	104th Congress of Corrections	Natl Congress of Correc	Hustn, TX	8/18-22/74	554.47		x			
Chf Narcs Team	Fbks PD	4th Annual Drug Trng Conf	Drug Enforcement Admins	Ft.Ldrdl,FL	10/28-31/74						(did not attend)
Lieutenant	Kodk PD	"	"	"	"	849.05		x			
Chief	Ktn PD	The High School Liaison Prgrm	LSU & New Orleans PD	Nw Orlns,LA	11/24-27/74	819.26		x			
Attorney	Pub Def	Basic Trial Strategy	Practicing Law Instit	Chicago,IL	8/26-28/74	751.00			x		
Attorney	Pub Def	Discovery Techniques Wrkshop	"	Dallas, TX	9/5-6/74	747.00		x			
Investigator	Div M V	Motor Vehicles Invest's Schl	Auto Theft Invest Schl	Sn Jose,CA	1/20-24/74	733.60	x				
Director	Pub Def	Natl Legal Aid-Defender Conf	Natl Legl Aid Def Assn	Nw Orlns,LA	11/13-16/74					x	#3
Depty Director	"	"	"	"	"	1000.00				x	
Attorney	Pub Def	Crim Adv Inst/Victms Cr Conf	Practicing Law Inst/ABA	Sn Dgo/LA,CA	1/17-18/75 1/23-25/75	500.00	x				

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS

1974

INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

1974 - continued
Page 2

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Poor	Comment Code
Sergeant	Palmer PD	Civil Emergency Ofcr Survival	CA Specialized Trng Ins	Sn Luis,CA	1/5-19/75	804.00	x				
Prob/Parl Ofcr	Correct	2nd Natl Conf Juven Justice	Juv Judges/D A Assoc	Nw Orlns,LA	3/9-13/75	977.95		x			
Instructor	Pb Saf Aca	Police Instructors Course	Northwestern Univ	Evnsn,IL	2/17-3/7,75		x				
"	"	"	"	"	"	3411.00	x				
CID	AST	Real Estate Trng (Fraud)	AK Assoc Realtors	Anch,AK	2/17-22/75		x				
"	"	"	"	"	"	250.00	x				
Officer	Div Aviatn	3rd Ann Bomb Tech & Inv Conf	Intl Assoc Bomb T & I	Phoenix,AZ	4/7-11/75		x				
Officer	"	"	"	"	"	1276.00					
Chf Hearng Ofcr	AK Transp	Administrative Law Session II	Natl Coll State Judicry	Reno,NV	11/12-17/75	500.00		x			#4
Registrar	Mtr V Div	AAWVA Annual Regn IV Conf	Am Assoc Mot Veh Admins	Albqrge,NM	5/18-22/75	735.93		x			
Lieutenant	Ktn PD	Police Instructor Training	Centrl Missouri Stat Un	Wmnsbrg,MO	3/3-21/75	932.00			x		
Chief Investig	AST	Arson Investigator's Seminar	Intl Assoc Arson Inves	Lincoln,NE	4/21-25/75	895.77	x				
EOD Specialist	AST	EOD Conference	Intl Assoc Bomb Techs	Phoenix,AZ	4/7-11/75	744.00	x				
Investigator	Pub Def	Semin on Investigative Techig	Natl Legal Aid & Def As	Mlwauke,WI	4/22-24/75	463.00					
R & I Supervisor	Pub Saf	Identification Conference	Intl Identification Ass	Biscayne,FL	7/27-31/75						(did not attend)
Detective	Ktn PD	Westrn Crime Intellig Semin	Westrn Crim Intell Ass	Boise,ID	5/11-14/75	484.00		x			
Detective	Anch PD	"	"	"	"	537.00					
"	Anch PD	Auto Theft Investig School	Auto Thft Invest Instit	Sn Diego,CA	6/2-6/75	267.00	x				#5
Superintendent	Correct	Correctional Institut Conf	San Jose U Dpt Admin Jg	Boise,ID	5/18-21/75	579.70		x			#6
Prob Ofcr (Frnk)	Correct	Juvenile Officers Institute	West Central Supts Conf	Minneap,MN	6/16-8/1,75				x		#7
Prob Ofcr (Ktn)	"	"	Univers of Minnesota	"	"	2083.00			x		
Investigator	Div M V	15th AK Crime Intell Seminar	Crimin Investig Bureau	Frnk,AK	6/11-13/75	260.40		x			
Superintendent	Correct	Correctional Institut Semin	West Central Supts Conf	Boise,ID	5/18-21/75	680.56			x		
Investigator	AST	Advanced Auto Theft School	San Jose University	Sn Jose,CA	6/2-6/75	695.23		x			
Comm Patrl Div	Ktn PD	Crime Intelligence Seminar	AK Peace Ofcrs Assoc	Frnk,AK	6/11-13/75	542.00		x			
Chief	Ktn PD	FBI Associates Retraining	FBI	Slt Lk Cty,UT	7/20-23/75	545.00		x			
Attorney	Bor&CtyJun	Short Course for Prose Attnry	S E Law Enforc Instit	Dallas,TX	6/23-26/75	800.52			x		
Sergeant	Jun PD	Crime Intelligence Seminar	AK Peace Ofcrs Assoc	Frnk,AK	6/11-13/75	345.00					
Chief	Sitka PD	In-Service Training Session	FBI Natl Academy Assoc	S L Cty,UT	7/20-23/75	501.00		x			
Chief	Sword PD	Crime Intelligence Seminar	AK Peace Ofcrs Assoc	Frnk,AK	6/11-13/75	348.00			x		
Chief	Palmer PD	"	"	"	"	159.00			x		
Director	Correc	Congress of Correc Meeting	Amer Assoc Corr Admins	Luisvle,KY	8/17-21/75						(did not attend)
Intrstate Com Coord	"	"	"	"	"	569.12		x			
Comm Detect Div	Ktn PD	Crime Intelligence Seminar	Western State College	Billings,MT	5/16-19/76	476.00					

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
1975
INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Table 3

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Poor	Comment Code
Trng/EEO Ofcr	Correct	Civil Rts Compli Trng	LEAA/LAONRA	Seatl,WA	11/15-17/75	396.78	x				#1
Person Ofcr	Courts	"	"	"	"	408.00	x				
Director	St EEO	"	"	"	"				x		
Dep Director	"	"	"	"	"	630.00			x		
Exec. Director	Par Bd	Amer Corr Assoc Ann Mtg	Amer Corr Assoc	Lousvle,KY	8/17-21/75	750.00	x				#2
Detective	Ktn. P D	Law Enforce School (Drugs)	D.E.A.	Butte,MT	9/29-10/10/75	597.00			x		
Investigator	AK St Trp	Burgly Investg. Seminar	Sacrmnto Cty Sher Ofc	Sacrmnto,CA	9/2-5/75			x			#3
"	"	"	"	"	"	1283.00	x				
Rehab Couns	Pub Def	Prisons, Psychi & the Law	Acad of Psych & Law	Boston, MA	10/23-26/75	865.00					
Hot Line Coord	Ktn Y Ad	1st Ntl Conf on Delin Preven	Natl Fed Yth Serv Bur	Niag F, NY	10/14-17/75	682.00		x			
Planning Ofcr	Fbks PD	Civil Rts Compli Trng	LEAA/LAONRA	Seatl,WA	10/15-17/75	445.00					
Exec Director	Hum Rts C	"	"	"	"	525.02	x				
Juv Probation	Correct	Juven Justice Workshop	Natl Coun Juv Judges	Reno,NV	10/19-24/75	616.97	x				
Treat Supvr	"	I Level Treatment Trng	West Conf Trng Schl	Denver,CO	10/1-3/75	526.15		x			
Ass AG Cons Protec	Dept Law	Cons Protect Comm Seminar	Natl Assoc A G's	Ashvle,NC	10/26-29/75	750.55		x			
Chief Investig	Pub Def	Investigation Conference	Natl Leg Aid Def Ass	Seatl,WA	11/12-14/75	525.00					
Director	CJC,UA	Ninth Prgrm for Lawyers	Harvard Law School	Cambrge,MA	7/25-30/76	1278.00					
Chief	Hoonh PD	Crises Intervention Wkshop	Crim Just Ctr, UA	Anchor,AK	11/3-5/75	347.40	x				#4
Chief Prob/Parole	Correct	Natl Sem Crts & Adult Prob	Instit for Crt Mangmt	Denver,CO	1/20-23/75	781.81		x			
Prob Ofcr	"	3rd Natl Conf on Juv Jstc	Natl Counc Juv Jdgs	San Fran,CA	2/1-5/76						
Sup Juv Prov Ofcr	"	"	"	"	"	1262.00					
R & I Superv	Pub Sfty	Security & Privacy Trng	Theorem Institute	Las Veg,NV	1/15-16/76	606.12			x		#5
Patrolman	Ktn PD	Fire Investigator I School	Calif St Fire Acad	Carmel,CA	2/8-13/76	489.00	x				
Fisc/Admin Ofcr	Pub Def	Defender Mngment Workshop	Natl Col Crim Def Lwyr	Wash, DC	2/19-22/76	865.00					
Chief Vehic Srvc	Pub Saf	Regl Conf AAMVA	Am Ass Motor Veh Admn	Las Veg,NV	5/3-7/76	574.09					
Pub Def, Bethel	Pub Def	Adv Evid Probs & Crs Examin	Natl Coll Pub Defdr	Wash, DC	2/26-29/76	1045.00					
Dir, Motor Vehic	Pub Saf	Ann Amer Asoc Mot Veh Admins	Region IV AAMVA	Las Veg,NV	5/3-7/76	278.00					
Regl. Fire Marshl	Pub Saf	IAAI Seminar	Intl Assn Arsn Invest	Indnapls,IN	4/19-23/76	759.00					
Arson Investgtr	Pub Saf	"	"	"	"	759.00					
Chf, Anch Air Sect	Pub Wrks	IAASP Annual Conference	Intl Ass Air & Sea Pol	Vancvr,BC	5/24-28/76	570.00					
Chf of Security	Pub Saf	"	"	"	"	516.00					
Investigator	Pub Saf	Annual Tran Conf	Calif Narc Info Met	Montry,CA	4/21-23/76	570.00					
Asst Attny Genl	Dep Law	Spec Meet Cons Prot Committe	Natl Assoc A G's	Crnsn Cty,NV	3/31-4/2/76	601.00					

CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS

1975

INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

1975 - continued
Page 2

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented by	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Above Avg	Average	Poor	Comment
Dir, State EEO	EEO Ofc	Affirmative Action Wrkshop	Am Assoc Affirm Act	San Digo,CA	4/21-23/76	506.00					
EOD Ofcr	Pub Wrks	Ann Conf IABTI	Intl Ass Bomb Tech Inv	Chicago,IL	5/30-6/4/76	687.00					
ATIS Director	Dep Admn	Security & Privacy Seminar	Search Group, Inc	San Fran,CA	4/29-30/76	451.42					
Sup Res & Invest	Pub Saf					455.00					*
Systems Analyst	Pub Saf	Spec. Mtng Motor Veh Admins	Am Ass Motor Veh Admin	Las Veg, NV	5/3-7/76	654.00					*
Chief Police	Ktn PD	Retraining Session	FBI Natl Acad	Boise, ID	7/18-21/76	479.00					
Bomb Technician	Anch PD	Annual Conference	Intl Ass Bomb Tech Inv	Chicago, IL	5/30-6/4/76	732.00					
St Crime Coord	Pub Saf	Tech Developmnt Wrkshop	Intl Ass Chiefs Police	Wash, DC	5/16-28/76	1541.00					
Dir, Mtr Veh Divsn	Pub Saf	Annual Conference	Am Ass Mtr Veh Admins	Las Veg, NV	5/3-7/76	695.00					
Staff Asstny	Pub Def	Trial of a Criminal Case	Natl Coll Crim Def Lwr	Houstrn, TX	5/17-28/76	1272.00					

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1973

Table 4

No. Grants	No. Parti- cipants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Crp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Prgrs				No Eval
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc	Nb Ave	Ave	Cost	
67	143	Corrections 28 Pub Sfty 13 Dept Law 11 Pub Def 9 A.S.T. 8 Par. Bd. 4 Courts 3 Cty Admin 3 Dpt HCSS 2 Dvn Pers. 2 An Com Col 1 Bggt Mgt 1 Cty-Bor Jn 1 Dpt Admin 1 Leg Audit 1 Pol Dpts 66 Unact PD 12 Anch PD 11 Ktn PD 8 Fbks PD 7 Juneau PD 4 Kodiak PD 3 Palmer PD 3 Wrangel PD 3 Seward PD 2 Ptrsbq 2 Kenai PD 2 N. Pole PD 2 Sitka PD 1 Cordova PD 1 Metla PD 1 Nome PD 1 Homer PD 1 Bethel PD 1 Soldtna PD 1	Grant Mgt 59 Enf Mgt 27 Narcotics 23 Prosecutn 9 Investgtn 7 E.E.O. 5 Juv Just 4 Defense 4 FBI Train. 3 Corrections 3 Admin. 3 Identif. 2 Instrctrs 2 Arson 1 Explosives 1 Cr Jst Cntr 1	Cv Svc Com 35 Drg Inf Ad 23 CIPA 23 An Com Col 22 Unknown 9 FBI 4 Ntl DA Ass 4 LEAA 3 MI Cn Jv Jd 3 A.S.T. 2 Am Cor Ass 2 N Col Df Lw 2 IACP 2 Intl ID Ass 1 Ntl Ass AGs 1 Cn St Govts 1 Battelle Cn 1 Ntl Con DAs 1 Prct Law In 1 Biscayne Co 1 Keeler Poly 1 N Cr Prv In 1 WA St Cntr 1 CA Dpt Just 1 SW Law Inst 1 AK Chfs Ass 1	107	\$14,944.79	\$140.00	36	\$21,819.59	\$606.00	\$36,764.32	\$257.00	20	21	14	3	4

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1974

Table 5

No. Grants	No. Participants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Grp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Progs				No Eval
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc	Ab	Ave	Poor	
54	61	Corrections 11 Pub Def 11 A.S.T. 9 De Mtr Veh 3 Dpt Law 2 Pub Sfty 2 Courts 2 Dr Aviatn 2 Cty Mtr 1 Cty-Box Jn 1 AK Trns Co 1 Pol Dpts 21 ***** Ktn PD 6 Anch PD 3 Seward PD 2 Sitka PD 2 Jun PD 2 Palmer PD 2 Metla PD 1 Haines PD 1 Ehke PD 1 Kodiak PD 1	Identif 10 Defense 10 Juv Just 8 Investgtn 7 Instr Tr. 5 Corrections 5 Narcotics 4 C.J. Mgt. 3 Explosvs 3 FBI Train 3 Consumer 2 Motr Veh 2 Cr Jst Gen 1 Admin Law 1 Arson 1 Prosecutn 1	FBI 7 AROA 5 Dr Ent Adm 4 Of Child Ad 4 Pr Law Inst 4 Trl Laws Am 3 N Lgl Df As 3 Intl Bomb Tocks Ass 3 W Hs Con Af 2 Intl ID Ass 2 Auto Tft In 2 N.W. Univ. 2 AK Ass Real 2 W Cr Int As 2 W-Ch Spt Cn 2 Univ. Minn 2 Am As Cor Ad2 Intl Cty Mgrrs Ass 1 N On Cr/Del 1 NW U Law Sc 1 N Cong Corr 1 LSU/N Or PD 1 CA Sp Tr In 1 Juv Judges 1 DAs Assoc 1 Ntl Col St Judic. 1 Am Ass Mot Veh Ad. 1 Cen MO St U 1 Intl Assoc Arson Inv 1 San Jose U 1 SE Law En I 1 West. St Co 1 Unknown 1	15	\$4,141.82	\$276.00	46	\$31,991.93	\$696.00	\$36,133.75	\$592.00	18	22	10	3	2

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1975

Table 6

No. Grants	No. Participants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Grp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Prgms				No Eval
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc	Ab	Ave	Poor	
40	43	Pub Sfty 11	Civ Rgts 7	LEAA 6	1	\$347.40	\$347.00	42	\$27,426.91	\$653.00	\$27,774.31	\$646.00	5	8	6	0	24
		Correcns 6	Juv Just 4	Am Ass Mot													
		Pub Def 5	Defense 4	Veh Ad 4													
		E.E.O. OF 3	Mot Veh 4	Ntl Council													
		Pub Works 2	Scty/Priv 3	Juv Judgs 3													
		A.S.T. 2	Arson 3	Sac Cnty													
		Dpt Law 2	Correcns 3	Sher Off 2													
		Courts 1	Investgtns 3	Ntl Ass AGs 2													
		Parole Bd 1	Narcotics 2	Ntl Acad Cr													
		Ktn Yth Ad 1	Consum Pro 2	Def Laws 2													
		Dpt Admin 1	Arst & Scty 2	Intl Assoc													
		Hum Rt Com 1	Explosives 2	Arson In 2													
		Cr Jst Ctr 1	Law 1	Intl As Air													
		Pol Dpts. 6	Crises Intr 1	/Scty Pol 2													
		FBI 1	Intl Assoc													
		Ktn PD 3	Tech Devel 1	Bomb Tch 2													
		FDKs PD 1		Srch Grp In 2													
		Hoonah PD 1		Am Cor Ass 1													
		Anch PD 1		Drg Enf Adm 1													
				Acad Psy &													
				Law 1													
				Ntl Fed Yth													
				Svc Div 1													
				W Ch Tr Sch 1													
				Ntl Lgl Def													
				Assoc 1													
				Harv Lw Sch 1													
				Cr Jst Ctr 1													
				Inst Cr Mgt 1													
				Theorom Ins 1													
				CA St Fire													
				Academy 1													
				Ntl Col Pub													
				Defenders 1													
				CA Narc Inf													
				Network 1													
				Am As Affrm													
				FBI 1													
				KACP 1													

Specialized Training Grant Participation
Comparison by System Component 1973-1975

Table 7

1973									
Component	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
Police	64	\$ 9,977.80	\$156.00	16	\$ 9,301.93	\$ 581.00	80	\$19,279.73	\$241.00
Legal	9	950.96	106.00	12	7,066.50	589.00	21	8,017.46	382.00
Corrections	26	2,586.28	99.00	5	2,005.61	401.00	31	4,591.89	148.00
Sub Total	99	13,515.04	137.00	33	18,374.09	557.00	132	31,889.13	242.00
Other Agencies	8	1,429.75	179.00	3	3,445.50	1149.00	11	4,875.25	443.00
Total	107	14,944.79	140.00	36	21,819.59	606.00	143	36,764.38	257.00
% of Total From Partic.	75%	41%		25%	59%		100%	100%	

1974									
Police	12	\$ 3,357.61	\$280.00	22	\$16,631.03	\$ 756.00	34	\$19,988.64	\$588.00
Legal	3	784.21	261.00	14	7,930.66	567.00	17	8,714.87	513.00
Corrections				8	6,194.31	774.00	8	6,194.31	774.00
Sub Total	15	4,141.82	276.00	44	30,756.00	699.00	59	34,897.82	592.00
Other Agencies				2	1,235.93	618.00	2	1,235.93	618.00
Total	15	4,141.82	276.00	46	31,991.93	696.00	61	36,133.75	592.00
% of Total From Partic.	25%	12%		75%	88%		100%	100%	

1975									
Police	1	\$ 347.40	\$347.00	20	\$12,689.21	\$ 604.00	21	\$13,036.61	\$621.00
Legal				9	7,609.55	846.00	9	7,609.55	846.00
Corrections				7	4,333.71	619.00	7	4,333.71	619.00
Sub Total	1	347.40	347.00	36	24,632.47	666.00	37	24,979.87	675.00
Other Agencies				6	2,794.44	466.00	6	2,794.44	466.00
Total	1	347.40	347.00	42	27,426.91	653.00	43	27,774.31	646.00
% of Total From Partic.	2%	1%		98%	99%		100%	100%	

Specialized Training Grants
Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency

1973-1975

Table 8

	No. of Participants	% of Total Participants	Expenditures by Agency	% of Total Expenditures
1973				
Police	80	56%	\$19,279.78	53%
Legal	21	15%	8,017.46	22%
Corrections	31	31%	4,591.89	12%
Other Agencies	11	8%	4,875.25	13%
Total	143	100%	36,764.38	100%
1974				
Police	34	56%	19,988.64	55%
Legal	17	28%	8,714.87	24%
Corrections	8	13%	6,194.31	17%
Other Agencies	2	3%	1,235.93	4%
Total	61	100%	36,133.75	100%
1975				
Police	21	49%	13,036.61	47%
Legal	9	21%	7,609.55	27%
Corrections	7	16%	4,333.71	16%
Other Agencies	6	14%	2,794.44	10%
Total	43	100%	27,774.31	100%

Specialized Training Grant Utilization

Three Year Comparison

Table 9

Year	Grants	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
			Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
1973	67	107	\$14,944.72	\$140.00	36	\$21,819.59	\$606.00	143	\$ 36,764.38	\$257.00
1974	54	15	4,141.82	276.00	46	31,991.93	696.00	61	36,133.75	592.00
1975	40	1	347.40	347.00	42	27,426.91	653.00	43	27,774.31	646.00
Three Year Total	161	123	19,433.94	158.00	124	81,238.43	655.00	247	100,672.44	409.00

Specialized Training Grants

Comments 1973-1975

Table 10

Comment Code	1973
1	Helped to face some of realities as opposed to fictions of the criminal justice process.
2	Evaluations ranged from excellent to satisfactory. There were several comments concerning disillusionment with the curriculum. Suggestions were made that the participants be surveyed for curriculum content wishes prior to design of instruction.
3	Better planning, organization, and scheduling is necessary. Set out to accomplish too much for diversity of participants.
4	Well presented, highly beneficial, encouraged professionalism.
5	Conference too large for interaction on meaningful basis.
6	Information and informal methods valuable, subgrantee training should continue, exchange of problems and recommendations very helpful.
7	Very helpful in learning of other chiefs' problems and resources.
Comment Code	1974
1	Every officer should attend periodically. Should be held in winter months to enable more to participate.
2	Standard procedures discussed, speakers excellent, information of considerable use. Instructor should limit participation to experienced public defenders with administrative responsibility.
3	Repetitive, poorer instruction than past conferences.
4	Enriching, worthwhile, systematic, particularly recommended.
5	Advanced extensive instruction, classroom and practical training. Enables more effective instruction. Time too short.
6	Personal interaction most valuable, Alaska's situation good.
7	Mix of police and probation officers valuable experience, program best for police officers with 1-5 years experience.
Comment Code	1975
1	Bring program to Alaska - localize.
2	National interaction, workshops, materials excellent.
3	Too many management level personnel attend. Should only send investigators. Should continue yearly attendance as long as remain in investigations.
4	Police officers should have this training, like to attend more programs of similar nature
5	Fair coverage Title 28 re criminal histories, audits etc. Poor instructional organization.

Specialized Training Grants
Manpower/Funding Comparisons
1973-1975

Table 11

Component	% Criminal Justice Employees by Component* 1975	% Funding for Spec. Train. Grants 1973-1975	% of Personnel Within Each Component* 1975
Police	48%	55%	69% Professional
Legal	30%	19%	55% Clerical
Corrections	22%	19%	78% Professional
Other Agencies	-	7%	-

* Preliminary figures from manpower research being conducted by Dr. John Angell, Criminal Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, Alaska

Specialized Training Grants
Comparison of Training Request Priorities
With Training Participation

Table 12

Priority	Training Priorities Identified by Agency Survey	Training Participation by Topic 1973	Training Participation by Topic 1974	Training Participation by Topic 1975
I.	Management and Supervision	Grant management, law enforcement management, narocotics	Criminal Identification Legal Defense, Juvenile Justice, Investigation	Civil Rights
II.	Investigation, community relations criminal and substantive law	Prosecution, Investigation EEO	Instructor Training Corrections, Narcotics	Juvenile Justice Legal Defense Motor Vehicle
III.	English communi- cations, criminal procedure, crime and alcohol, juvenile procedures, Native Alaska, narocotics and dangerous drugs	Juvenile justice, Legal defense FBI, Corrections, Adminis- tration	Management explosives FBI Training	Security privacy arson, corrections investigation
IV.	Court room procedures, family disturbances correctional practices, judicial system	Identification, instructor training arson, explosives	Consumer protection motor vehicle administrative law, arson, prosecution	Narcotics consumer protection airport security explosives

PART II

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1976 THROUGH 1979

INTRODUCTION

As in Part I of this study, Part II will provide an analysis of the data acquired from all approval/claim forms and evaluation of training forms completed by students awarded specialized training grants during the years 1976, 1977, 1978 and 1979. The same format has been followed in Part II in order to facilitate a comparison and analysis of the two time periods but also so that each of the two studies might be utilized independently of the other.

The data acquired from the official documents for the four year period was reduced to tabular form for ease of analysis (see Part II Appendix, List of Tables). As in Part I of this study, the individualized data tables indicate the number of grants per year, the agencies, the topics of the training courses, the training organizations, where and when the training took place, the funding costs for each participant, and a rating of the training programs from excellent to poor based on the participant's evaluation.

The individualized information has been consolidated into total utilization figures for each year under the same categorized headings except that involvement by each agency, participation by topic and sponsoring training organizations have been identified in order to facilitate analysis.

From the utilization tables a breakdown and comparison of data by system component and a comparison of in-state, out-of-state, and total program participation levels for each of the

four years was facilitated, the same as in Part I of the study.

The tabular data provides the opportunity to compare not only levels of individual and financial involvement for each year but also the involvement of the police, legal and correctional components for each year and all four years. A comparison of in-state and out-of-state programming is also made possible through design of these tables.

Figures for each year closely reflect participation levels in manpower and money invested in specialized training for each of the four years. Expenditures reflect the per diem and travel costs from federal funds and matching agency contributions, but they do not include program enrollment costs which have been borne by the employee's sponsoring criminal justice agency. Expenditures do not reflect any costs associated with an individual's salary, fringe benefits, time away from the job (which may have required overtime compensation to other employees or temporary loss of services) or similar cost factors which may be related to the employee's participation in a training program.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1976

Table 1 following provides the identification of each participant by position who utilized the grant fund for 1976 as well as program information for which each grant was provided. Of the 20 grants issued for specialized training in 1976, 24 individuals participated at a cost of \$14,473.19. Of these individuals, only 4 took part in training programs provided within Alaska at a cost of \$970.00, and, conversely, 20 practitioners traveled outside the state for programs costing approximately \$13,500. Costs for the in-state participants averaged \$242.50 compared to an average of \$675.15 per Outside training program participant (see Table 5).

Police, legal and correctional personnel participating in the 1976 grant program totaled 18 of the 24 participants for the year (Table 10). Of these, the police (12) and correctional (2) personnel took part in attendance at training programs offered outside the state while legal personnel were divided between in-state (1) and out-of-state (9) attendance. Of special interest from the 1976 figures is the fact that 93% of the expenditures for the year was directed to the 83% of all participants who took part in training outside the state. Conversely, only 7% of the year's training money was directed to permit 17% of the participants to attend programs within the state.

Training topics drawing the greatest interest (Table 5) of criminal justice practitioners in 1976 were concerned with computer technology, law enforcement investigation and juvenile

justice. However, none of these topics attracted more than four individuals and only the International Association of Chiefs of Police (as a sponsoring group) attracted as many as three persons to their offerings.

More specifically, of the four persons who took part in programs offered within the state, two attended an abused women's aid session in Anchorage, one took part in a "Microdata" production, and the fourth person attended a youth theory workshop (the latter two programs also in Anchorage). Of the 20 Alaskans attending "outside" programs, 12 were law enforcement officers who attended various conferences and seminars dealing with such topics as homicide investigation, computer capabilities, arson, bomb investigations, and juvenile justice. The remainder of "outside" participants (8) attended programs of individual interest ranging from juvenile diversion to sentencing.

Table 10 figures indicate that 58% of the 1976 expenditures were utilized by police agency personnel who comprised 50% of the total participants in all training programs. 13% of the year's expenditures were utilized by legal personnel. While corrections provided 2 of the personnel receiving grants, the percentage of overall expenditures employed by these personnel (10%) was less than that for "other" agency personnel (19%) who sent 6 people to various programs.

"Other" agency representatives include personnel from divisions or departments that are not directly involved in criminal justice system functions but may have peripheral interests or responsibilities with justice agencies.

As explained in Part I of this study, the participatory data is not intended to separate grants awarded to the major agency categories for purposes of drawing conclusions that law enforcement personnel utilized more or less funding than did corrections or legal personnel. Costs of training in the various major component categories vary when consideration is given to the length of various training programs, the distance of the program from the employee's work station, and the comparative needs for training programs among the major components. An examination of funded levels of participation is useful only in establishing a factual picture of where the funds were allocated. This study does not address the reason for differences that may or may not exist, or what guidelines, if any, may have been used to determine the allocation of the resources. Therefore, the data is helpful in indicating where the funds were expended but not why.

Of the 22 program evaluations received in 1976, 15 were evaluated as above average or excellent, 6 were rated average and 1 received a poor rating. (Note: Several evaluation comments have been selected as examples to indicate the range of ratings from poor to excellent and the reasoning for the evaluation for each of the four one year grant programs. See Table 12.)

The level of involvement for both personnel and funding in 1976 was about average for the four year period in that an average number of criminal justice personnel participated (24), the expenditures were moderate (\$14,473.19), and a greater amount of participation in training programs took place outside

the state (83% of total participation) for the four year period
1976 - 1979 inclusive.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1977

In 1977 the CJPA funded 20 grants which provided individualized training for 23 criminal justice practitioners at a total funded level of \$18,151.40 (Table 6). Just over \$16,300.00 of the total expended was directed to 19 personnel enrolled in programs outside of the state. Four personnel were enabled to seek training within the state at a funded level of just over \$1,800. The average cost per participant in the state was \$457.30 while out-of-state costs averaged \$859.06 (Table 6). Only three individuals who received grants were from "other" agencies outside of the police, legal or corrections components. The Juneau Teenage Club sent one of these individuals to a National Youth Workers Conference, another from the Division of Data Processing (Department of Administration) attended a program entitled "Virtual Sequential Access Method" and the third was the Director of the Office of Volunteer Services who attended a national forum on volunteers in criminal justice.

The pattern of geographical participation established in 1976 was the same in 1977; i.e., 83% of all criminal justice practitioners attended specialized training programs out-of-state while 17% remained in Alaska for training. 90% of the expended funds went to out-of-state program participants who comprised 83% of all participants taking part in the program, while 10% of the funds paid for 17% of the participants who attended training in-state (Table 9).

Criminal investigation and resource management topics

attracted four and three participants respectively and officer survival, securities fraud and arson topics each attracted two participants. 13 other topics attracted single person involvement only. There were no easily identifiable agencies drawing large numbers of personnel to training sessions, but the International Association of Chiefs of Police offered courses which were attended by six Alaskans in various topic areas. California State University, John Reid College, University of California at Davis, Northwestern University and the Justice Center of the University of Alaska at Anchorage all attracted Alaska justice practitioners. This involvement in training and education programs offered on campuses of higher education appears in 1977 as an indication of the expansion of offerings in the justice related curriculum in university programs across the nation (Table 6).

Of the identified training sponsors, the Los Angeles Police Department S.W.A.T. Team provided training to two Alaskans, the Justice Center, UAA, attracted the Director of the Craig Department of Public Safety to a seminar on "Criminal Justice Management," and another Justice Center offering, on "Substantive Criminal Law," brought the Police Chief of the City of Savoonga to Anchorage as a student/participant. These three programs drew all four of the justice personnel who participated in training programs via CIPA grants within the state in 1977. There was the same number of training "providers" attracting grant recipients within the state in 1977 as there was in 1976, and the same level of in-state grant participation. As stated above, in 1976 in-state programs

attracted 4 practitioners while 1977 programs attracted the same number under the specialized training grant program.

The police agencies were recipients of an increased level of involvement and funding in 1977 as compared to 1976 (Table 10). 70% of the year's expenditures paid for the 70% of all participants, who were from police agencies, to attend training programs. Legal practitioners utilized 13% of the funds, corrections used none, and other agency personnel required 17% of the total expenditures. Again, the data indicates the utilization of funds among the agency categories but cannot be used to explain the rationale for the differences. Therefore, no conclusions should be drawn on the value of grant disbursement differentials.

Of special interest is that correctional personnel utilized none of the funds for the year or, stated differently, none of the participants attending specialized training grant funded programs were from corrections. For comparison, 1976 saw correctional personnel employ 10% of the funds for the year and this resulted in their representing 8% of all participants in specialized training.

Twelve law enforcement personnel participated in training programs out-of-state in 1976 at an average cost of \$698.88 per person. In 1977, 12 law enforcement officers went to out-of-state programs at an average cost of \$901.58 per person. Also in 1977, police in-state participation (4) had cost an average of \$457.30. It is obvious that police personnel participate and do so at a much higher cost in out-of-state programs than within the state.

Sixteen of the 23 criminal justice practitioners evaluated

the training involvement at above average to excellent in quality. Average ratings were given to six programs; none rated poor evaluations and one program received no evaluation. (See Table 12 for sample comments.)

Total grants numbered 20 in both 1976 and in 1977. The number of participants dropped from 24 to 23, but expenditures increased from \$14,473.19 to \$18,151.40. The major change that took place from the previous year was that 70% of the funds for 1977 were utilized to fund 70% of all participants who were from law enforcement agencies. This was not a reversal of the previous year's funding pattern but an expansion of it.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1978

Table 3 lists the 28 participants receiving specialized training grants for the 1978 program. The 20 grants, which required funding at \$13,579.93, represent a much lower level of funding but a greater number of personnel participation than the previous two years. The most dramatic difference, however, in 1978 participation data, occurs in in-state vs. out-of-state funding and levels of involvement when compared to the previous two years. Twelve criminal justice professionals were funded to attend programs provided within the state. These programs were funded an average of \$308 which permitted five of these twelve participants to attend a Youth Alternative Services Network Conference in Anchorage and the remaining seven to take part in various law enforcement courses in-state. Conversely, 16 participants were funded at a total cost of \$9,872.25 (73% of the total expenditures) to attend programs out-of-state. The average cost for these participants was \$617.02 or double the cost per person of the in-state trainee (Table 9).

The average cost per grantee varied not only between trainees sent out-of-state from police agencies (\$573) and the legal components (\$809), but also differed greatly from the cost of correctional training, which was zero for the second consecutive year. These costs reflect actual average expenditures in 1978 for police, corrections and legal agencies. The comparison is useful in comparing the costs of enabling representative practitioners to take part in individualized programs. It should

be remembered, however, that some types of training may be inherently more expensive per unit than are others. Time, distance and comparative agency needs and resources for training should also be considered.

As illustrated in the Part I study covering the period 1973-1975, it should be noted here that the average cost figure for all agencies sending personnel to out-of-state training programs for each of the 4 years in this Part II study was much higher than the costs for in-state training. Conversely, and more importantly, the average cost figures for in-state participation is significantly lower than for out-of-state training programs.

The topic of greatest interest for training in 1978 was in the area of prevention services for juveniles. Police liability, security, fraud, police internal affairs, criminal investigation, fire and arson, officer survival and trial techniques programs drew small groups of interested Alaskan practitioners. However, no single training program attracted relatively large numbers of practitioners. The Southern Police Institute trained four Alaskans under the grant program, while 5 pairs of participants were drawn toward programs offered by five other agencies in-state and out. The remaining practitioners attended a variety of training programs singly to learn more of subjects ranging from shoplifting and police fleet management to canine training and drug enforcement (Table 7).

The level of funding and level of personnel involved in training programs from police agencies increased still further

from the previous years' 70% of the total expenditures. Legal practitioners' funding involved increases from 13% of the total spent for specialized training in 1976, and 13% of the 1977 expenditures to 18% of the 1978 money. Correctional personnel were not funded, the same as the previous year (Table 10).

The evaluations of training programs that were attended by criminal justice practitioners during the 1978 grant year were complete except that two participants submitted no evaluation comments. Of those that were available, 7 programs were rated as excellent, 12 above average and 7 programs received average ratings. (Sample comments, Table 12.)

As stated previously, the 1978 grant year was significantly different from the previous two years in level of funding, level of participation by practitioners, and in training funded for in-state programs. Funding was one thousand to four thousand-five hundred dollars less than in 1976 and 1977. There were four more participants in 1978 than in 1976 and five more than in 1977. Twelve individuals (43%) received funding for in-state training programs in 1978 compared to 17% (4) of the participants in 1977 and 17% (4) of the 1976 participants.

One important consideration for the decrease in expenditures and increase in the numbers of justice practitioners utilizing specialized training grant funds in 1978 may be related to increased program opportunities in-state and increased agency funding capabilities which provided training without the need for previous levels of CJPA funding.

In light of the CJPA goal stated earlier that ". . . a balance will be achieved by earmarking a reasonable ratio of available funds to each of the components of legal, police, and corrections. . . .", it seems apparent that funding practices did not meet this goal in any of the previous three years. For example, police in 1976 received 58% of all grant expenditures, 70% of all 1977 grant money and 78% of the 1978 funds from this program. At the same time corrections received 10% of the 1976 funds but received no funds or grants at all in either 1977 or 1978. No explanations or deductions are reasonably available, from the material being analyzed, to explain this gap between goal and practice.

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANT UTILIZATION - 1979

In 1979 the Criminal Justice Planning Agency provided \$16,160.07 worth of specialized training grants. This amount provided 28 grants for 28 justice practitioners, the same number of grants that were awarded in the previous year. As in the previous three years no one program topic attracted a large number of grant recipients.

Twenty-one of the 28 justice participants took part in out-of-state programs at a total cost of nearly \$14,000 (or an average of \$666 per person cost) while the remaining seven attended in-state programs at a cost of approximately \$2100 or an average cost of \$310.67 per person (Table 8).

Police, legal and correctional personnel totaled 15 participants for the year while the balance of recipients came from "other" agencies (13). Neither the four legal nor the three correctional personnel took part in in-state programs and only two police personnel were funded for in-state offerings. Seven from justice related agencies participated in programs within Alaska.

In 1979 a change occurred in regard to the percentages of funds directed toward the separate units of the justice system. Table 10 indicates that law enforcement expenditures dropped dramatically from the previous three years' percentage allocation, (58% in 1976, 70% in 1977 and 78% in 1978), to a 30% share in 1979. Expenditures for legal personnel remained nearly the same as in previous years (15%), corrections jumped from zero in 1977 and

1978 to 16% in 1979. "Other" agencies received a substantial increase from only 4% in 1978 to a full 39% of all 1979 expenditures.

Juvenile justice topics accounted for four training grants while three persons each were enabled to attend programs on topics including family violence and corrections. Two each attended sessions on women in crisis and white collar crime. The remaining funded participants were involved individually in courses that ranged in topics from extradition and data processing to sexual assault and experimental education (Table 8).

Geographically 87% of the 1979 training funds went to out-of-state program involvement and conversely, 13% of the funds were provided to personnel to receive their training within the state. Interestingly the 39% of total expenditures for 1979 grants provided for almost half of all participants (48%) who were from "other" agencies than police, legal, or corrections units. These "other" personnel represented such agencies or groups as Family Intervention Services, Anchorage Child Abuse Board, Juneau School District, Suicide Prevention and Crisis Center, Aware, Inc., Anchorage Council on Alcohol, S.T.A.R., Bering Sea Women's Group, Alaska Wilderness School and four different group homes or teen clubs from Bethel, Fairbanks, Sitka and Seward.

Again, apparently, as in the previous three years, no one training sponsor attracted a significant number of participants. (Note: Unfortunately 16 of the individual data sheets did not indicate the sponsoring groups so that it is possible that this conclusion is erroneous or at least inadequate.)

The majority of courses were rated as above average (6) or excellent (12) while six participants rated their programs as average. None of the 1979 programs were given a poor rating by the participants; however, there were four programs which were not evaluated or for which no evaluation form was available for assessment (see Table 8).

The pattern established in earlier years was repeated in 1979 with regard to the ratio of the average costs per participant of in-state and out-of-state programs. In 1979 that average per person cost for out-of-state programs (\$666) was at least double the average per person cost for in-state participation (\$310).

FOUR YEAR COMPARISON

Over the four year period analyzed in Part II of this study a total of \$61,905.59 was expended on 81 specialized training grants for individual Alaska criminal justice practitioners. The comparative figures (Table 11) indicate that costs for total program participation ranged from a low average of \$485 per individual in 1978, to \$789 in 1977. At the same time the numbers of those able to successfully obtain a share of the training funds totaled a high of 28 individuals in 1978 to a low of 23 in 1977, not a broad range. The table indicates that overall participation in out-of-state and within-state training programs totaled 27 in-state and 75 out-of-state for the four year period. The in-state training participation was greatest in 1978 (12 individuals) and declined to four individuals in both 1976 and 1977. While the average costs of "outside" training were consistently higher, the in-state specialized training costs based on the use of these grants was consistently and significantly lower.

The average out-of-state training costs totaled double the amount required to train the average practitioner within-the-state. Of course, numbers of personnel and the amount of money required to permit individualized training to occur are not the only factors to be considered in making these comparisons.

As concluded in Part I of this study, a substantial justification for out-of-state participation in individualized training has been made. Many programs have been unavailable within the state and yet are worthwhile (some are essential) to the continuing professional development of criminal justice practitioners.

Examples of such outside programs have included the national level district attorney and public defender conferences, the annual meetings of the American Correctional Congress, the national conferences on juvenile justice, and a few specialized law enforcement programs available only at regional schools.

An average of \$15,476.40 was expended each year of the four year period for training an average of 26 participants. The average cost for each participant over the four years was \$712 per person per training session. These averages are useful only in terms of their potential use for planning for a future period on an overall system basis. They are probably not very useful in planning fund allocations toward a given agency or training effort.

There are difficulties inherent in the subjective classification of the evaluation remarks of the participants and the non-receipt, or non-availability, of 16 of 28 program participant evaluations for 1979 reduces even a relatively subjective effort to questionable usefulness. As we stated in Part I, it is not possible to compare the evaluation of in-state vs. out-of-state programs in any meaningful or dependable manner. A much more extensive and systematic effort should be made to establish a reliably sound and valid evaluation format that would enable useful comparisons to be made. To reiterate our earlier suggestion, it may be quite helpful to know whether programs presented in-state were seen as more valuable than those "outside" and why, what subject matter was the most beneficial in terms of the relationship to actual job performance, and whether individual programs would be worthy of continued participation from Alaskan

practitioners on a larger scale.

It would also be quite helpful to receive suggestions or ratings from participants about the potential usefulness of bringing certain outstanding speakers and/or programs to the state. It seems clear that more persons could benefit and at lower cost if trainers were brought to the trainees rather than the reverse whenever possible.

APPENDIX

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	1976 Individualized Data.	II-23
2	1977 Individualized Data.	II-24
3	1978 Individualized Data.	II-25
4	1979 Individualized Data.	II-26
5	Utilization for 1976.	II-27
6	Utilization for 1977.	II-28
7	Utilization for 1978.	II-29
8	Utilization for 1979.	II-30
9	Comparison by System Component, 1976-1979 .	II-31
10	Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency, 1976-1979	II-32
11	Four Year Comparison.	II-33
12	Comments, 1976-1979	II-34
13	Manpower/Funding Comparisons, 1976-1979 . .	II-35

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
1976
INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Table 1

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented By	Location	Dates	Costs	Excellent	Above Avg	Average	Poor	Comment Code
Lieutenant	Ketchikan PD	National Homicide Institute	GORMAC	Los Angeles	9/14-17	595.00	x				
Director	Family Connection	Juvenile Diversion	Human Resource Development	Las Vegas	10/4-6	500.00		x			1
Nurse	Div. of Mental Health	Mental Health for the Convicted Offender, Patient & Prisoner	North Carolina Medical Society	Raliegh, NC	10/27-29	698.93			x		2
	Alaska Judicial Coun.	Sentencing	Nat'l Coll. of State Judiciary	Reno, NV	11/14-19	471.10		x			3
Administrator	Div. of Corrections	1976 Juvenile Justice Mngmt Inst.	Nat'l Coll. of Juv. Justice	Reno, NV	12/5-10	700.50		x			
Sergeant	Juneau PD	Criminal Investigation	Regional Crim Just Trng Center	Modesto, CA	1/17-28	500.00	x				
Lieutenant	Ketchikan PD	EEO/Developing Police Computer Capabilities	IACP	Las Vegas, NV	1/10-2/3	822.00	x				4
Records Bureau Supervisor	Anchorage PD	Developing Police Computer Cap.	IACP	Las Vegas, NV	1/10-13	918.05			x		
Juvenile Officer	Ketchikan PD	4th Ann. Cong. of Juv. Just.	Nat'l Coun. of Juv. Court Judges	Los Angeles	2/6-10	701.00		x			
State Fire Marshall	Public Safety	28th Ann. Int'l Assn of Arson Investigators	Int'l Assn of Arson Investigators	Lansing, MI	5/1-6	767.50		x			
Dep. Fire Marshall	" "	" " " " "	" " " " "	" "	"	"	x				
Inspector	Public Safety	1st Annual A.P.P.R.O. Conf.	Assn of Police Planning & Res. Officers	San Diego, CA	3/31-4/2	603.32			x		
Supervisor	Public Safety	Computer Capabilities	IACP	Las Vegas, NV	1/10-13	841.85		x			
Project Dir.	Juneau Comm. on Assaults Against Women	Violence in the Home: Battering Women	Abused Women's Aid in Crisis	Anchorage	3/25-36	250.00			x		5
Financial Off.	" "	" " " "	" " " "	" "	"	"		x			
BOD Spec.	Dept of Pub Works	Bomb Techs & Investigator's Sem.	5th Ann Int'l Assn of Bomb Techs & Investigators	Miami, FL	5/1-13	781.02					
Patrol Sgt.	Anchorage PD	" " " "	" " " "	" "	"	500.00		x			
	Alaska Judicial Coun.	Microdata "Realite"	Microdata	Anchorage		250.00		x			
Detective	Fairbanks PD	Homicide & Maj. Crime Scene Inv.	Northwestern Univ.	Bellevue, WA	8/15-19	961.00	x				
Crime Lab Supvr.	Public Safety	Identification Seminar	WA/PC Int'l Assn for Ident.	Twmwater, WA	6/3-4	409.36	x				
Secretary	Ketchikan Youth Adv.	Workshop on Org. Theory & Network	Alaska Youth Alt. Service	Anchorage	7/11-13	220.00				x	6
Ex. Director	Parole Board		American Correctional Assn	Milwaukee, WI	8/20-26	835.05			x		
Security Examiner (2)	Dept of Comm. & Econ Development	Securities Fraud Seminar		St Petersburg, FL	8/23-25	1130.00			x		7

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS
1977
INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Table 2

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented By	Location	Dates	Cost	Excellent	Above Avg.	Average	Poor	Comment Code
Director	Teenage Club	Nat'l Youth Workers Conf	Nat'l Youth Organization	Washington DC	6/7-10	500.00	x				1
Officers (2)	Fairbanks PD	Officer Survival	Los Angeles S.W.A.T. Team	Anchorage	8/15-18	989.00	x				2
Lieutenants	Ketchikan PD	84th Ann IACP Conf	IACP	Los Angeles	10/1-6	864.00		x			
Asst Atty Gen (2)	Dept of Law	Securities Fraud Seminar	No. Am. Securities Admin Assn	St Petersburg, FL	8/23-25	1190.26			x		3 & 4
	Dept of Admin	Virtual Sequential Access Method		Minn, MN	7/5-9	1469.00					
Detective	Fairbanks PD	Burglary Prevention	California State Univ.	Long Beach, CA	10.12-14	943.00		x			
Detective	Ketchikan PD	Crim. Interrogation & Beh. Analysis	John Reid College	Chicago, IL	10.10-17	955.00			x		
	Alaska Jud. Council	Survey Research for Pub. Admin.	Univ of California, Davis	Davis, CA	9/14-23	1115.37	x				5
Zone Cndr	AST	Police Manpower & Res Mngmt Wrkshp	IACP	Atlanta, GA	9/19-23	820.00			x		
Director	Craig Dept of Pub Saf	CJ Mngmt Seminar for Practitioners	CJC	Juneau	8/29-30	298.24			x		6
Major	Anchorage PD	Police Labor Relations Seminar	IACP	St Louis, MO	10/17-21	500.00		x			
Juv Officer	Ketchikan PD	Police Juv Procedures Workshop	IACP	Salt Lake City	8/22-26	794.00		x			
Director	Off of Vol Services	7th Ann Nat'l Forum on Vol in CJ	Office of Volunteer Services	Dallas, TX	11/05-14	541.04	x				
	DHSS	The Police-Social Work Team	Nat'l Counc of Juv & Fam Ct Judges/Nat'l Assn of Soc Wrks/IACP	Chicago, IL	11/6-9	691.53		x			
Police Chief	City of Savoonga	Subs Crim Law for Law Enf Off		Anchorage	12/ -19	541.96		x			
Detective	Fairbanks PD	Homicide & Maj Crime Scene Inv	Northwestern Univ	Evanston, IL	2/20-24	1157.00		x			
Chief Inv	Dept of Pub Saf	Homicide Investigation Seminar	Southern Police Institute	Louisville, KY	1/9-20	1487.50	x				
Investigator	" "	" " "	" " "	" "	" "	" "	x				
Chief	Wrangell PD	Arson Seminar	Int'l Assn of Arson Inv	Anaheim, CA	4/23-28	500.00		x			
Ordr, Metro Unit	Fairbanks PD	Mgmt of Multi-Agency Inv Units	IACP	Las Vegas, NV	2/20-24	560.00			x		
State Fire Marshall	Dept of Pub Saf	Arson Seminar	Int'l Assn of Arson Inv	Anaheim, CA	4/23-28	751.00		x			

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS

1978

Table 3

INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented By	Location	Dates	Cost	Excell	Above	Avg	Poor	Comment Code
Lieutenant	Dept of Pub Safety	Police Civil Liability Wrshp	AELE	San Francisco	5/21-24	519.00	x				
Det Sgt	Fairbanks PD	Seminar on Securities Fraud	Al Div of Banking & Securities	Juneau	4/3-6	578.50	x				
Det	"	"	"	"	"	"			x		
Lieutenant	Dept of Pub Safety	Internal Affairs	Southern Police Institute	Louisville, KY	6/19-30	250.00	x				
Investigator I	"	"	"	"	"	"	x				
Investigator II	"	Homicide Investigation Seminar	"	"	6/5-16	500.00					
Investigator III	"	"	"	"	"	"			x		1
Chief of Police	Ketchikan PD	Wrkshp on Police Civil Liability	AELE	San Francisco	5/21-24	620.00		x			
Crime Prev Off	Valdez PD	Shoplifting Trng Seminar	Wash. State Atty Gen's Office	Issaquah, WA	4/27	451.28	x				2
Chief of Police	Homer PD	19th Ann NW Arson Seminar	Oregon Fire Chiefs Assn	Eugene, OR	5/8-12	500.00		x			3
Investigator	Dept of Pub Safety	Police Fleet Mgmt Workshop	IACP	Jackson, MI	6/19-21	500.00	x				4
Asst Atty Gen	Dept of Law	14th Annual Conference	Nat'l Assn of Extradition Off	Atlanta, GA	5/21-24	764.29	x				
Officer	Mun. of Anchorage	6th Ann Canine Trainers Seminar	St. Paul Police Dept Canine Unit	St Paul, MN	5/19-21	700.87	x				
Asst Dist Atty(2)	Dept of Law	Trial Techniques Seminar	Nat'l Coll of Dist Atty	Los Angeles, CA	3/14-18	1662.92		x			
Chief,	Anchorage PD	FBI Nat'l Academy Ass Trng Sem	FBI	Port Angeles, WA	7/16-19	500.00		x			
Sergeant	Sitka PD	Drug Enforcement School	Dept of Justice	Anchorage	7/24-8/4	480.08	x				
Investigator	Dept of Pub Safety	Int'l Assn of Auto Theft Inv Sem	Int'l Assn of Auto Theft Inv	Mobile, AL	8/6-11	1078.50		x			
Sergeant	Anchorage PD	Officer Survival	University of Alaska	Fairbanks	8/3-5	287.02			x		
Pub Safety Off	North Star Borough	Anchorage PD Academy	Anchorage PD	Anchorage	7/5-9/5	500.00					
Fire Marshall I	Dept of Pub Safety	Fire and Arson Inv Seminar	Nat'l Fire Prev & Control Admin	Salem, OR	9/15-16	1075.39	x				
Corporal	Juneau PD	Officer Survival	University of Alaska	Fairbanks	8/3-5	528.58	x				
Trng Officer	Homer PD	Field Training Officer School	Anchorage PD	Anchorage	8/21-25	255.00		x			
Director	Bethel Group Home	Preventive Services Conference	Youth Alternative Service Network	Anchorage	10/16-21	100.00	x				
Counselor	Petersburg Youth Prgm	"	"	"	"	"		X			
Director	Nome Com Ctr Yth Prgm	"	"	"	"	"		X			
Director	Petersburg D C Ctr	"	"	"	"	"		X			
Director	Ketch Youth Adv Prgm	"	"	"	"	"		X			

11-25

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS

Table 4

1979

INDIVIDUALIZED DATA

Position	Agency	Course Title	Presented By	Location	Dates	Cost	Excell Above / Average	Poor	Comment Code
	Family Intervention Services	Homebuilders Trng Class		Yakima, WA	11/13-17	404.56	x		
Family Therapist	Anch Child Abuse Bd	Violence in Families Nat'l Symp		Hot Springs, AR	10/29-11/1	804.75	x		
Juvenile Officer	Ketchikan PD	6th Nat'l Conf on Juv Just		San Diego, CA	2/4-8	953.00	x		
Probation Off III	Corrections	Prob/Parole Practice	Fordham Univ	Tuscon, AZ	1/14-20	705.26			
Principal	Juneau School Dist	6th Nat'l Conf on Juv Just		San Diego, CA	2/4-8	682.08	x		
Pub Defender	Public Defender Agency	Defending Crimes of Violence	11th Ann Crim Advocacy Inst	Denver, CO	2/23-24	500.00	x		
Director	Suicide Prev & Crisis Center	Nat'l Conf of Info and Referral Services		Phoenix, AZ	4/5-8	500.00	x		1
Deputy Fire Marshall	Dept Pub Safety	1979 Arson Inv Seminar	Int'l Assn of Arson Inv	Williamsburg, VA	5/21-25	934.00	x		
Coordinator	Dept of Law	1979 Nat'l Symposium on Pre-Trial Services	Nat'l Assn of Pre-Trial Services	Louisville, KY	4/27-5/1	935.98	x		
Officer	Dept of Transportation	7th Ann Int'l Assn of Bomb Techs & Investigators		San Jose, CA	5/27-6/1	666.20	x		
Director	Aware, Inc.	Workshop of Aiding Battered Women		Anchorage, AK	4/28-29	281.14	x		
Asst Atty Gen	Dept of Law	1979 Nat'l Assn of Extradition Off	Nat'l Assn of Extradition Off	Carson City, NV	5/20-23	503.52	x		2
Police Chief	Seward PD	1979 Western States Regional Trng Session for FBI Nat'l Academy Grads		Los Angeles, CA	7/8-11	444.43	x		
Info Specialist	Anch Counc on Alcohol	Women in Crisis Conf		NY, NY	5/17-19	681.35			
Lieutenant	Ketchikan PD	Police Civil Liability	Americans for Effective Law Enf	San Francisco	5/14-16	872.00	x		
Prob Officer	Corrections	Degree Program - Probation Practice	Fordham Univ	Tuscon, AZ	6/24-31	1357.18			
Data Systems Coord	Anchorage PD	31-Hour Corresimar	Data Processing Mngmt Assn	Anchorage, AK	5/30-6/1	375.00	x		
Paralegal Asst	Dept of Law	2nd Comp Trng Course on White Crime		Seattle, WA	6/24-30	453.15	x		
Research Analyst	S.T.A.R.	Nat'l Coalition Against Sexual Assault Conference		Lake Geneva, WI	8/24-26	500.00			
Corporal	Juneau PD	Uniformed Investigator School	Anchorage PD	Anchorage, AK	8/27-31	415.00	x		
Director	Vol in Corrections	1979 Nat'l Assn of Vol in Corr Forum		Biloxi, Miss	10/7-10	500.00	x		
Program Director	Bering Sea Women's Group	North West Women's Aciton on Family Violence		Tacoma, WA	9/19-21	628.92	x		
Director	Alaska Wilderness Sch	7th Ann Conf on Experiential Ed		Portsmouth, NH	10/14-16	500.00	x		
Counselor	Bethel Group Home	Conf on Prev Youth Services	Youth Alternative Services Network	Anchorage, AK	11/7-9	407.00	x		
	Presbyterian Hosp House	Workshop on Crisis Intervention				100.00	x		
Director	Sitka Teen Club	Conf on Prev Youth Services	Youth Alternative Services Network	Anchorage, AK	11/7-9	496.55	x		
	Seward Teen Club	Workshop on Comm Education Prog Development & Staff Development				100.00	x		
Detective	Fairbanks PD	White Collar Crime Enforcement Strategies	Nat'l Center on White Collar Crime	Seattle, WA	6/24-30	459.00	x		

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1976

Table 5

No. Grants	No. Participants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Grp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Prgms							
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc	Ab	Aver	Ave	Poor	No Eval		
20	24	Ketch PD	3	Investig	3	GORMA	1	4	\$970.00	\$242.50	20	\$13,503.19	\$675.15	\$14,473.19	\$603.05	6	9	7	1	1
		Family		Juv Jstc	3	Hurn Res Dev	1													
		Connctn	1	Correctns	2	NC Med Soc	1													
		Div of		Sentencing	1	Nat'l Col of														
		Ment Hlth	1	Computers	4	Juv Justice	1													
		AK Judicial		Arson	2	Nat'l Col of														
		Council	2	Plan & Res	1	State Jud	1													
		Correctns	1	Battered		Regional CJ														
		Juneau PD	1	Women	2	Trng Cntr	1													
		Anch PD	2	Explosives	2	IACP	3													
		Public Sfty	5	Organizat		Nat'l Council														
		Juneau Com		Theory	1	Juv Ct Jdgs	1													
		on Asslts		Identif.	1	In't Assn														
		agnt Wmn	2	Secur		Arson Inves	2													
		Dept of		Fraud	2	Assn of Pol														
		Pub Wrks	1			Plan & Res														
		Frtnks PD	1			Off Conf	1													
		Ketch Yth				Abusd Wmn														
		Adv	1			Aid in Crsis	2													
		Parole Bd	1			Int'l Assn of														
		Dept of Cm				Bomb Techs	2													
		& Econ Dev	2			Microdata	1													
						NW Univ	1													
						Int'l Assn														
						for Ident	1													
						AK Yth Alt														
						Services	1													
						Amer Corr														
						Assn	2													
						(not indic)	1													

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1977

Table 6

No. Grants	No. Parti- cipants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Grp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Progra					No Eval		
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Ccost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc	Ave	Ave	Poor				
20	23	Tnage Clb	1	Yth Wrkrs	1	Nat'l Yth Org	1	4	\$1,829.20	\$457.30	19	\$16,322.20	\$859.06	\$18,151.40	\$789.19	5	11	6	0	1
		Frbnks PD	5	Offcr Surv	2	IA SWAT Tm	2													
		Ketch PD	3	IACP Ccnf	1	IACP	6													
		Dept of Lw	2	Sec Fraud	2	NA Sec Admin														
		Dept of		Data Proc	1	Assn	2													
		Admin	1	Burg Prev	1	Jn Reid Coll	1													
		AK Jd Cncl	1	Inv	4	UC Davis	1													
		AST	1	Research	1	CJC	2													
		Craig Dept		Res Mngt	3	Vol Svcs	1													
		of PS	1	Labor Rel	1	NW Univ	1													
		Anch PD	1	Juv Proc	1	So Pol Inst	2													
		Vol Svcs	1	Vol in CJ	1	Int'l Assn of														
		DHSS	1	Police-Soc		Arson Inv	2													
		City of		Work	1	Cal St Univ	1													
		Savoonga	1	Subs Crim		(not indic)	1													
		Public		Law	1															
		Safety	3	Arson	2															
		Wrangell																		
		PD	1																	

II-28

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1978

Table 7

No. Grants	No. Parti- cipants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Grp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Progs							
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc Avg	Ab Ave	Ave	Poor	No Eval			
20	28	Dept of PS	8	Police Liab	2	AELE	2	12	\$3,707.68	\$308.97	16	\$9,872.25	\$617.01	\$13,579.93	\$484.99	7	12	7	0	2
		Frbnks PD	2	Sec Fraud	2	AK Div of														
		Ketch PD	1	Int Affrs	2	Bkng & Sec	2													
		Valdez PD	1	Inv	3	Wash St Atty														
		Homer PD	2	Shoplifting		Gen's Office	1													
		Dept of Law	3	Trng	1	Ore Fire Chfs														
		Mun. of		Fire &		Assn	1													
		Anch	1	Arson	2	INCP	1													
		Anch PD	2	Extrdtion	1	Nat'l Assn of														
		Sitka PD	1	Canine		Extrd Off	1													
		North Star		Timers	1	St Paul PD														
		Borough	1	Trial Techs	2	Canine Unit	1													
		Juneau PD	1	FBI Academy	1	Nat'l Col of														
		Youth Alt		Drug Enf	1	Dist Atty	2													
		Srvc Ntwrk	5	Off Srval	2	FBI	1													
				Anch PD		Anch PD	2													
				Academy	1	Nat'l Fire Prv														
				Off Field		& Cont Admin	1													
				Trng	1	Dept of Just	1													
				Prev Svcs	5	Int'l Assn of														
				Mngmt	1	Auto Theft In														
						Invest														
						UA	2													
						(not indic)	5													

Specialized Training Grants

Utilization for 1979

Table 8

No. Grants	No. Parti- cipants	No. Participants By Agency	No. Participants By Topic	No. Participants By Spons Grp	In-State-Participation			Out-of-State Participation			Total Program		Eval of Prgrs					No Eval
					No. Part	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	No. Part.	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Total Cost	Ave. Cost	Exc	Aver	Ave	Poor		
28	28	Fam Int Srv	1	Family	2	7	\$2,174.69	\$310.67	21	\$13,985.38	\$665.97	\$16,160.07	\$577.15	6	12	6	0	4
		Anch Child	3	Violence	1													
		Abuse Board	4	Juv Jstc														
		Ketch PD	2	Correctns	3													
		Corrections	2	Def Violnt														
		Juneau Schl	1	Crimes	1													
		District	1	Referrl														
		Pblc Def	1	Serv	1													
		Agency	1	Arson	1													
		Suicide Prev	1	Pre-trial														
		Public Sfty	1	Services	1													
		Dept of Law	2	Explosives	1													
		Dept of Trns	1	Battered														
		Aware, Inc	1	Women	1													
		Seward PD	1	Extradtn	1													
		Anch Counc on	1	FBI Trng	1													
		Alcoholism	1	Women in														
		Anch PD	1	Crisis	2													
		Attny Gen	1	Police														
		S.T.A.R.	1	Liability	1													
		Juneau PD	1	Data Proc	1													
		Vol in Corr	1	White Crim	2													
		Bering Sea	1	Sexual Ass	1													
		Womens Grp	1	Inv	1													
		AK Wldrms		Experentl														
		School	1	Education	1													
		Bethel Grp	1	Commun Ed	1													
		Home	1															
		Presby Hsp																
		House	1															
		Sitka Teen																
		Club	1															
		Seward Teen																
		Club	1															
		Franks PD	1															

Specialized Training Grant Participation

Comparison by System Component 1976-1979

Table 9

1976									
Component	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
Police				12	\$ 8,386.59	\$ 698.88	12	\$ 8,386.59	\$698.88
Legal	1	\$ 250.00	\$250.00	3	1,601.10	533.70	4	1,851.10	462.78
Corrections				2	1,535.55	767.77	2	1,535.55	767.77
Sub Total	1	250.00	250.00	17	11,523.24	677.84	18	11,773.24	654.07
Other Agencies	3	720.00	240.00	3	1,979.95	659.98	6	2,699.95	450.00
Total	4	970.00	242.50	20	13,503.19	675.16	24	14,473.19	603.05
% of Total Prgm Partic.	17%	7%		83%	93%		100%	100%	
1977									
Police	4	\$1,829.20	\$457.30	12	\$10,819.00	\$ 901.58	16	\$12,708.20	\$794.26
Legal				3	2,301.63	767.21	3	2,301.63	767.21
Corrections									
Sub Total	4	1,829.20	457.30	15	13,120.63	874.70	19	15,009.83	789.99
Other Agencies				4	3,201.57	800.39	4	3,201.57	800.39
Total	4	1,829.20	457.30	19	16,322.20	859.06	23	18,151.40	789.19
% of Total Prgm Partic.	17%	10%		83%	90%		100%	100%	
1978									
Police	7	\$3,207.68	\$458.24	13	\$ 7,445.04	\$ 572.70	20	\$10,652.72	\$532.64
Legal				3	2,427.21	809.07	3	2,427.21	809.07
Corrections									
Sub Total	7	3,207.68	458.24	16	9,872.25	617.02	23	13,079.93	568.69
Other Agencies	5	500.00	100.00				5	500.00	100.00
Total	12	3,707.68	308.97	16	9,872.25	617.02	28	13,579.93	484.99
% of Total Prgm Partic.	43%	27%		57%	73%		100%	100%	
1979									
Police	2	\$ 790.00	\$395.00	6	\$ 4,328.63	\$ 721.44	8	\$ 5,118.63	\$639.83
Legal				4	2,392.65	598.16	4	2,392.65	598.16
Corrections				3	2,562.44	854.15	3	2,562.44	854.15
Sub Total	2	790.00	395.00	13	9,283.72	714.13	15	10,073.72	671.58
Other Agencies	5	1,384.69	276.94	8	4,701.66	587.71	13	6,086.35	468.18
Total	7	2,174.69	310.67	21	13,985.38	665.97	28	16,160.07	577.15
% of Total Prgm Partic.	25%	13%		75%	87%		100%	100%	

Specialized Training Grants
Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency
1976-1979

	No. of Participants	% of Total Participants	Expenditures by Agency	% of Total Expenditures
1976				
Police	12	50%	\$ 8,386.59	58%
Legal	4	17%	1,851.10	13%
Corrections	2	8%	1,535.55	10%
Other Agencies	6	25%	2,699.95	19%
Total	24	100%	14,473.19	100%
1977				
Police	16	70%	12,708.20	70%
Legal	3	13%	2,301.63	13%
Corrections	-0-	-0-	-----	-0-
Other Agencies	4	17%	3,201.57	17%
Total	23	100%	18,151.40	100%
1978				
Police	20	71%	10,652.72	78%
Legal	3	11%	2,427.21	18%
Corrections	-0-	-0-	-----	-0-
Other Agencies	5	18%	500.00	4%
Total	28	100%	13,579.93	100%
1979				
Police	7	26%	4,659.63	30%
Legal	4	15%	2,392.65	15%
Corrections	3	11%	2,562.44	16%
Other Agencies	13	48%	6,086.35	39%
Total	27	100%	15,701.07	100%

Specialized Training Grant Utilization

Four Year Comparison

Table 11

Year	Grants	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
			Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
1976	20	4	\$ 970.00	\$240.00	20	\$13,503.19	\$675.16	24	\$14,473.19	\$603.05
1977	20	4	1,829.20	457.30	19	16,322.20	859.06	23	18,151.40	789.19
1978	20	12	3,707.68	308.97	16	9,872.25	617.02	28	13,579.93	484.99
1979	27	7	2,174.69	310.67	20	13,526.38	676.32	27	15,701.07	581.52
Four Year Total	87	27	8,681.57	321.54	75	53,224.02	709.65	102	61,905.59	711.56

Specialized Training Grants

Comments 1976-79

Table 12

Comment Code	1976
1	Increased familiarity with subject.
2	Too much time was spent emphasizing other states particular systems.
3	Was made more aware of other jurisdiction's problems and solutions.
4	Felt more time should be spent on problem solving exercises.
5	Enhanced awareness.
6	Felt the workshop was good and had the tools necessary to formally organize and accomplish much in the future.
7	Topic did not relate to Alaska.
Comment Code	1977
1	Was much better than last year's conference
2	Made it possible for this officer to detect mistakes he and other policemen were making.
3	The seminar was not always entirely on point. The seminar suffered from having instructors that weren't well versed in the area of criminal law.
4	Too much emphasis was placed on Florida law.
5	Subject matter had been well researched and organized.
6	The course should have been longer. The instruction seemed to be pointed to a very large department.
Comment Code	1978
1	A lot of information was received merely by associating with members of other police depts.
2	There were some classes that did not pertain to Alaska.
3	The course lacked in practical exercises and in general was designed for the beginning investigator.
4	Any police fleet manager who does not avail himself of this course will be operating in a vacuum and will waste time and money making mistakes.
Comment Code	1979
1	The institute was beneficial in some respects and not too beneficial in others.
2	The program was in some instances much too general and in other instances it was too highly specialized.

Specialized Training Grants
Manpower/Funding Comparisons
1976-1979

Table 13

Component	% Criminal Justice Employees by Component*	% Funding for Spec. Train. Grants	% of Personnel Within Each Component*
	1975	1976-1979	1975
Police	48%	59%	69% Professional
Legal	30%	15%	55% Clerical
Corrections	22%	6%	78% Professional
Other Agencies	-	20%	-

* Figures from manpower research completed by Dr. John Angell, Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, 1978.

PART III

SPECIALIZED TRAINING GRANTS 1973 THROUGH 1979

A SEVEN YEAR OVERVIEW

Three hundred forty-nine state and local government personnel have been the recipients of the Criminal Justice Planning Agency's Specialized Training Grants over the seven year period from 1973 through 1979 inclusive. A total of \$162,578.03 was distributed over this period to enable criminal justice practitioners from courts, the legal community, corrections and police agencies, as well as those from agencies having at least peripheral interest in justice affairs, to attend training or education programs in-state and out. If the total expenditures were divided by the total number of participants, each grant would have been awarded at an average expenditure of \$465.84.

Of the 349 grant recipients, 190 (55%) were from police agencies, 61 (17%) were from the court or legal components, 51 (15%) were from corrections, and 47 (13%) were from "other" agencies having justice interests or obligations.

While these seven year averages may be of general interest, it should be noted that there were significant differences in funding levels from year to year, from one component to another, and from the initial three year study period to the second four year study period.

For example, from 1973 through 1975 there were 247 participants funded at a cost of \$100,672.44 or an average expenditure of \$408.00 per person. From 1976 through 1979, 102 people received grants totaling \$61,905.59 or an average expenditure of \$711.56 per participant. In 1973 75% (107) of the 143 grantees attended

programs within the state which resulted in an average cost per participant for that year of \$257, the lowest average cost for all seven years and the year of the greatest total number of participants. In contrast, there were 42 personnel (99% of all grant recipients) who received a grant for an out-of-state program in 1975 and that year's average cost per participant was \$646. In general, there is a pattern which emerges over the seven year period which indicates that as in-state participation increases, more people participate and this in turn tends to lower the average cost per person for each year. In other words, more people participate at less cost for in-state programs than for out-of-state programs.

While 1973 and 1974 reflected program costs of 36.7 and 36.1 thousand dollars respectively, the expenditures for 1975 dropped to approximately 27.8 thousand dollars. Participation levels too, dropped from a high of 143 in 1973 to 61 in 1974 and finally 43 in 1975.

The second segment of the study, the four year period 1976 through 1979, saw further drops in expenditures and participation levels. For example, in 1976 \$14.4 thousand was expended on the individualized grants. In 1977 the figure was raised somewhat to \$18.1 thousand but dropped again to \$13.5 thousand in 1978 and finally back up slightly to \$16.1 thousand in 1979. In no case, however, did the 1976-1979 period witness expenditures even close to the earlier three year period. Participation levels also dropped to an average of approximately 26 for the four year period.

Another obvious area of interest extracted from the data is the fluctuation of the number and total value of grants awarded to the representatives of various agencies over the seven years. Except in the last year of the seven year period (1979) police participants have in every year received approximately half the total funds for that year. However, in certain years they received 70% (1977) and 78% (1978) of the total expenditures. Only in 1979 were the law enforcement applicants funded at a low of 30% of the total expenditures. Even this lowest level of police funding was greater than the percentage of funds directed to the other justice segments in any one year of the previous six years; i.e., no other justice unit had been granted as much as 30% of the funds in any of the previous years (Table 2). An exception occurred only in 1979 when "other" agency representatives received 39% of the total funds awarded that year.

As Table 4 indicates, an average of 55% of the expenditures over the total seven year period was awarded to representatives of police agencies even though police personnel make up 48% of the number of criminal justice professionals in the state. The legal personnel who represent 30% of all criminal justice personnel received an average of 20% of the seven years of funding, and the correctional component, 22% of all criminal justice employees, received 12% of all specialized training grants between 1973 and 1979 inclusive. Although it is difficult, if not impossible, to estimate the number of "other" agency personnel having criminal justice interests or responsibilities, it is known that this segment of participants received an average of

13% of the funds over the seven year period.

It may be useful to re-examine the substantial differences in awards made from year to year to in-state participant in relationship to the higher costs associated with funding personnel to attend "outside" programs. This seems to be the second of meaningful and obvious patterns of differences identified in the data (the first being differential funding by criminal justice components described above).

In every year of the seven years of the study the average cost per in-state grant recipients was at least half, and in one year (1973) one-fourth, the average cost of sending an individual to an out-of-state program. Further, the percentage of total expenditures allocated to in-state participation always enabled proportionately more individuals to attend programs in-state. As examples, in 1973 41% of the funds for that year enabled 75% of the year's participants to attend various training sessions within Alaska, in 1974 12% of the funds sent 25% of the grantees to in-state sessions and finally in 1979 13% of the funds enabled 25% of the personnel receiving grants to remain in-state for training.

It is clear, then, that this second major pattern should be considered if stretching the decreasing and limited funds is to be an important factor in future funding strategies.

An examination of the topics which attracted criminal justice personnel from 1973 to the end of the decade is useful in that the areas of professional interest can be assessed. Clear patterns of interest are indicated in the year 1973 (see Part I, Table 4)

when large numbers of grant recipients were involved in grant management, law enforcement management, and narcotics training programs. Even in 1974, programs such as criminal identification, legal defense, investigation, and juvenile justice attracted an identifiable majority of state and municipal personnel. In 1975 (Part I, Table 6) it becomes more difficult to distinguish between topics by level of participation because of fewer total grantees and a range of topics which attracted fewer numbers to each program than in previous years.

In the following four year period, 1976 through 1979, there are no clearly defined topics which attracted large numbers of grant recipients. Except for a new topic area which had not appeared in earlier years, battered women - women in crisis - sexual assault, the topics for the four year period are compatible with those offered in the earlier three year period.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A few conclusions can be drawn from the seven years of data, which may be of general value for planning the future direction of the program effort. No value judgments or priorities are intended in these statements which are based on the analysis of the data in Parts I and II of this study.

1. The police or law enforcement component of the criminal justice system in Alaska, has consistently (i.e., for six out of the seven years of the study period) received at least 50% of all expenditures for each year. The one exception was in 1979 when a low of 30% of the funds were directed to police personnel. However, no other justice unit had been granted as much as 30% of the funds in any year.
2. The average per person cost of sending criminal justice personnel to out-of-state training programs has been, in every year, approximately double the average per person cost for in-state program participants.
3. Related to # 2 above, consistently more personnel have participated in local productions (within the state) at less cost. That is, for each and every year of the study a lower proportion of the total expenditures for each year enabled a greater percentage of personnel to attend in-state programs. As examples, in 1973 41% of the total expenditures sent 75% of the total number of participants to in-state productions and in 1979 only 13% of the total funds enabled 25% of all participants to attend training within the state.

4. Evaluations completed by participants have consistently indicated satisfaction with the training programs that were attended. This conclusion, however, may be of dubious usefulness since it does not address the issue of the source of funding. That is, if the participants were able to garner the financial support from their own agencies or some resource other than the CJPA, it would undoubtedly have no effect on the evaluation of the session which was attended. It is clear however that many of the participants were able to attend the various programs because these funds were available.
5. Closely related to item # 1, but a distinct finding in its own right, total expenditures for the program have not been proportionate to the number of employees in the three major components of the criminal justice system. The police who represent 48% of all justice personnel in the state received an average of 55% of the funds over the seven year period, legal personnel (30% of all justice practitioners) received 20% of the funds, and corrections (22% of all justice personnel) received 12% of all funds. Participants from "other" (peripheral) agencies acquired 13% of all grant funds. Except for the earlier quoted objective (see Part I, page 22-23) of equitable distribution of available funds among the agencies of justice ". . . legal, police, and corrections. . .", this conclusion might otherwise be of little significance.

6. While there have been a few minor shifts in topical interest from year to year there is little indication of major change in direction of training participation or emphasis over the seven year period. That is, there tends to be a great deal of similarity of training topics which attract Alaska justice personnel over most of the past decade. For example, someone is sent every year, year after year, to arson training programs, explosives programs, and narcotics programs. The data and the consistency of this phenomenon would lead to a conclusion that this is a standardized practice and that it apparently only requires a decision as to "who" should attend each year.

These general conclusions, and others which may be gleaned from the available data, can be utilized to formulate a set of recommendations which might be used as a starting point for reviewing the objectives of the specialized training grant program. After seven years of administration, noticeable patterns have emerged which can be evaluated as to their present value and timeliness. As training and educational opportunities within Alaska improve and as the funding pattern and the emphasis on training improve within the major agencies of justice within the state, it is perhaps time to reconsider overall training needs and resources statewide.

At the conclusion of Part I of this study a discussion and recommendations were presented which appear to be relevant to the expanded study. Those recommendations do appear to have validity when measured against the conclusions enumerated above.

The results of this study including the six general conclusions above could be utilized as the nucleus for discussions within and among the various justice agencies toward the goal of establishing objectives and priorities for the future of the specialized training grants program. It seems that to simply repeat past years' practices may be wasteful of limited resources. There is no doubt that a continuing need exists to enable the small town police chief or bush magistrate to participate in training programs. But it does seem that economic considerations would dictate that justice personnel acquire the greatest benefit possible from limited dollars. It seems questionable that it is good policy to continue to send personnel to the same kinds of programs "outside" year after year when those programs might be better utilized if brought to Alaska where more could attend and at lesser expense.

It would seem to be important to justify the balance or imbalance of spending directed to the three major components of the justice system - legal, police and corrections. It might be helpful to coordinate all training and educational opportunities through a central clearinghouse office within the state, but not attached to any one particular justice unit.

These and other issues which imply the structuring and prioritizing of certain value judgments with regard to training should be taken into consideration in a total review of continuing professional development practices, needs, and resources within the State of Alaska.

The specialized training grant program administered by the Criminal Justice Planning Agency over the past several years has provided both a valuable service and a financial resource to many professionals who might not otherwise have been able to continue their professional development. This study would suggest however, that it is now time to rethink both the purpose and the direction of that program in order to give it a new direction and more meaningful purpose.

APPENDIX
LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Comparisons by System Component, 1973-1979. .	III-12, 13
2	Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency, 1973-1979	III-14, 15
3	Seven Year Comparison	III-16
4	Manpower/Funding Comparisons, 1973-1979 . . .	III-17

Specialized Training Grant Participation
Comparison by System Component 1973-1979

Table 1

1973									
Component	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
Police	64	\$ 9,977.80	\$156.00	16	\$ 9,301.93	\$ 581.00	80	\$19,279.73	\$241.00
Legal	9	950.96	106.00	12	7,066.50	589.00	21	8,017.46	382.00
Corrections	26	2,586.28	99.00	5	2,005.61	401.00	31	4,591.89	148.00
Sub Total	99	13,515.04	137.00	33	18,374.09	557.00	132	31,889.13	242.00
Other Agencies	8	1,429.75	179.00	3	3,445.50	1149.00	11	4,875.25	443.00
Total	107	14,944.79	140.00	36	21,819.59	606.00	143	36,764.38	257.00
% of Total Program Partic.	75%	41%		25%	59%		100%	100%	

1974									
Police	12	\$ 3,357.61	\$280.00	22	\$16,631.03	\$ 756.00	34	\$19,988.64	\$588.00
Legal	3	784.21	261.00	14	7,930.66	567.00	17	8,714.87	513.00
Corrections				8	6,194.31	774.00	8	6,194.31	774.00
Sub Total	15	4,141.82	276.00	44	30,756.00	699.00	59	34,897.82	592.00
Other Agencies				2	1,235.93	618.00	2	1,235.93	618.00
Total	15	4,141.82	276.00	46	31,991.93	696.00	61	36,133.75	592.00
% of Total Program Partic.	25%	12%		75%	88%		100%	100%	

1975									
Police	1	\$ 347.40	\$347.00	20	\$12,639.21	\$ 604.00	21	\$13,036.61	\$621.00
Legal				9	7,609.55	846.00	9	7,609.55	846.00
Corrections				7	4,333.71	619.00	7	4,333.71	619.00
Sub Total	1	347.40	347.00	36	24,632.47	666.00	37	24,979.87	675.00
Other Agencies				6	2,794.44	466.00	6	2,794.44	466.00
Total	1	347.40	347.00	42	27,426.91	653.00	43	27,774.31	646.00
% of Total Program Partic.	2%	1%		98%	99%		100%	100%	

(continued next page)

Table 1 (continued)

1976									
Component	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
Police				12	\$ 8,386.59	\$ 698.88	12	\$ 8,386.59	\$698.88
Legal	1	\$ 250.00	\$250.00	3	1,601.10	533.70	4	1,851.10	462.78
Corrections				2	1,535.55	767.77	2	1,535.55	767.77
Sub Total	1	250.00	250.00	17	11,523.24	677.84	18	11,773.24	654.07
Other Agencies	3	720.00	240.00	3	1,979.95	659.98	6	2,699.95	450.00
Total	4	970.00	242.50	20	13,503.19	675.16	24	14,473.19	603.05
% of Total Prgm Partic.	17%	7%		83%	93%		100%	100%	
1977									
Police	4	\$1,829.20	\$457.30	12	\$10,819.00	\$ 901.58	16	\$12,708.20	\$794.26
Legal				3	2,301.63	767.21	3	2,301.63	767.21
Corrections									
Sub Total	4	1,829.20	457.30	15	13,120.63	874.70	19	15,009.83	789.99
Other Agencies				4	3,201.57	800.39	4	3,201.57	800.39
Total	4	1,829.20	457.30	19	16,322.20	859.06	23	18,151.40	789.19
% of Total Prgm Partic.	17%	10%		83%	90%		100%	100%	
1978									
Police	7	\$3,207.68	\$458.24	13	\$ 7,445.04	\$ 572.70	20	\$10,652.72	\$532.64
Legal				3	2,427.21	809.07	3	2,427.21	809.07
Corrections									
Sub Total	7	3,207.68	458.24	16	9,872.25	617.02	23	13,079.93	568.69
Other Agencies	5	500.00	100.00				5	500.00	100.00
Total	12	3,707.68	308.97	16	9,872.25	617.02	28	13,579.93	484.99
% of Total Prgm Partic.	43%	27%		57%	73%		100%	100%	
1979									
Police	2	\$ 790.00	\$395.00	6	\$ 4,328.63	\$ 721.44	8	\$ 5,118.63	\$639.83
Legal				4	2,392.65	598.16	4	2,392.65	598.16
Corrections				3	2,562.44	854.15	3	2,562.44	854.15
Sub Total	2	790.00	395.00	13	9,283.72	714.13	15	10,073.72	671.58
Other Agencies	5	1,384.69	276.94	8	4,701.66	587.71	13	6,086.35	468.18
Total	7	2,174.69	310.67	21	13,985.38	665.97	28	16,160.07	577.15
% of Total Prgm Partic.	25%	13%		75%	87%		100%	100%	

Specialized Training Grants

Percentage Participation & Expenditure by Agency

1973-1979

Table 2

	No. of Participants	% of Total Participants	Expenditures by Agency	% of Total Expenditures
1973				
Police	80	56%	\$19,279.78	53%
Legal	21	15%	8,017.46	22%
Corrections	31	31%	4,591.89	12%
Other Agencies	11	8%	4,875.25	13%
Total	143	100%	36,764.38	100%
1974				
Police	34	56%	19,988.64	55%
Legal	17	28%	8,714.87	24%
Corrections	8	13%	6,194.31	17%
Other Agencies	2	3%	1,235.93	4%
Total	61	100%	36,133.75	100%
1975				
Police	21	49%	13,036.61	47%
Legal	9	21%	7,609.55	27%
Corrections	7	16%	4,333.71	16%
Other Agencies	6	14%	2,794.44	10%
Total	43	100%	27,774.31	100%

(continued on next page)

Table 2 (continued)

	No. of Participants	% of Total Participants	Expenditures by Agency	% of Total Expenditures
1976				
Police	12	50%	\$ 8,386.59	58%
Legal	4	17%	1,851.10	13%
Corrections	2	8%	1,535.55	10%
Other Agencies	6	25%	2,699.95	19%
Total	24	100%	14,473.19	100%
1977				
Police	16	70%	12,708.20	70%
Legal	3	13%	2,301.63	13%
Corrections	-0-	-0-	-----	-0-
Other Agencies	4	17%	3,201.57	17%
Total	23	100%	18,151.40	100%
1978				
Police	20	71%	10,652.72	78%
Legal	3	11%	2,427.21	18%
Corrections	-0-	-0-	-----	-0-
Other Agencies	5	18%	500.00	4%
Total	28	100%	13,579.93	100%
1979				
Police	7	26%	4,659.63	30%
Legal	4	15%	2,392.65	15%
Corrections	3	11%	2,562.44	16%
Other Agencies	13	48%	6,086.35	39%
Total	27	100%	15,701.07	100%

Specialized Training Grant Utilization

Seven Year Comparison

Table 3

Year	Grants	No.	In-State Participation		No.	Out-of-State Participation		No.	Total Program Participation	
			Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost		Expenditure	Ave Cost
1973	67	107	\$14,944.72	\$140.00	36	\$21,819.59	\$606.00	143	\$36,764.38	\$257.00
1974	54	15	4,141.82	276.00	46	31,991.93	695.00	61	36,133.75	592.00
1975	40	1	347.40	347.00	42	27,426.91	653.00	43	27,774.31	646.00
Three Year Total	161	123	19,433.94	158.00	124	81,238.43	655.00	247	100,672.44	408.00
1976	20	4	\$ 970.00	\$240.00	20	\$13,503.19	\$675.16	24	\$14,473.19	\$603.05
1977	20	4	1,829.20	457.30	19	16,322.20	859.06	23	18,151.40	789.19
1978	20	12	3,707.68	308.97	16	9,872.25	617.02	28	13,579.93	484.99
1979	27	7	2,174.69	310.67	20	13,526.38	676.32	27	15,701.07	581.52
Four Year Total	87	27	8,681.57	321.54	75	53,224.02	709.65	102	61,905.59	711.56
Seven Year Total	248	150	28,115.51	187.44	199	134,462.45	675.69	349	162,578.03	465.84

Specialized Training Grants
Manpower/Funding Comparisons
1973-1979

Table 4

Component	% Criminal Justice Employees by Component*	% Funding for Spec. Train. Grants	% of Personnel Within Each Component*
	1975	1973-1979	1975
Police	48%	55%	69% Professional
Legal	30%	20%	55% Clerical
Corrections	22%	12%	78% Professional
Other Agencies	-	13%	-

* Figures from manpower research completed by Dr. John Angell, Justice Center, University of Alaska, Anchorage, 1978.